DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 911 HE 003 021

AUTHOR	Harari, Maurice
TITLE	Global Dimensions in U.S. Education: The University.
INSTITUTION	New York Friends Group, Inc., New York. Center for War/Peace Studies.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	60p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for War/Peace Studies, 218 East 18th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Cross Cultural Training; Developing Nations; *Educational Research; *Foreign Relations; *Higher Education; *International Education; Research

ABSTRACT

This pamphlet, 1 in a series of 4 concerning international education, presents an examination of the major policy issues confronting higher education in the U.S. and in relating meaningfully to overseas societies. The recommendations for U.S. research overseas can be summarized in 4 major points: (1) U.S. scholars, universities, and donors have major responsibilities to each other as well as to the larger international scholarly community in the professional conceptualization, funding, and ethical conduct of international studies' research--particularly in the less developed countries. (2) There is a need to promote the internationalization of U.S. social science research through increased international collaboration and funding. (3) There is a need to promote communication and clearinghouse arrangements within the U.S., as well as on a world scale, relating to international social science research. (4) The strengthening or creation of social science data banks in the less developed countries should be promoted and merits the cooperative attention of scholars from different societies, including local scholars. (Author/HS)

ED 061911

GLOBAL DIMENSIONS IN U.S. EDUCATION: THE UNIVERSITY

MAURICE HARARI

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Center for War/Peace Studies
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HE 003 021

This is one of four studies (see back cover) published as a cooperative venture by the three organizations described below, with the help of a grant from the United States Office of Education.

The Education Commission of the International Studies Association is a permanent structure established within the Association serving all members whose activities involve international studies education. The Commission works to improve the productivity of its members at all educational levels—precollege, college, and postcollege, professional and nonprofessional. It helps those involved in the study and teaching of international relations to learn about and develop educational methods and materials that may help in achieving their objectives. It sponsors research, information exchange, and the acquisition of support resources, and will provide an institutional location where those concerned with improving international relations education can seek mutual reinforcement, constructive criticism, and evaluation.
WILLIAM D. COPLIN, *Chairman*

The Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association was created in April, 1970, as a result of the expanding involvement of the political science profession in educational research, development, and service at the precollegiate level. The Committee is charged with two primary responsibilities: to provide a continuing assessment of the discipline's relationship to elementary and secondary education; and to develop and implement a long-range strategy to mobilize resources more effectively to benefit political science education at the precollegiate level. The Committee's work has been supported and facilitated by the Political Science Education Project of the APSA, funded by a grant from the United States Office of Education.
RICHARD C. SNYDER, *Chairman*

The Center for War/Peace Studies of the New York Friends Group is a national, nonprofit, nonpartisan educational, research, and consulting agency designed to work with individuals, educational institutions, and organizations to increase among their students, teachers, and general constituencies knowledge and awareness of the international dimension of the problems of conflict and social change. The Center concentrates on educational institutions at the precollegiate and collegiate levels.
ROBERT W. GILMORE, *President*

CHARLES BLOOMSTEIN, *General Editor,* Center for War/Peace Studies
Copyright © 1972 by the New York Friends Group, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

Each of these four welcome publications should be viewed as a preliminary map of a very complex domain, as well as a justification and plea for the amount and kind of detailed work needed to take full advantage of this early stage of what we hope will be a major revision and revitalization of the so-called international dimensions of education. In addition, the individual essays belong to a set whose collective purport can be highlighted in several ways.

First, it is widely acknowledged that educational decisions—what shall be taught and/or learned how by whom—are often based on inadequate evidence and unstated or unclear value criteria, with outcomes often irrelevant, ineffective, or unintentionally damaging. But as we gain more systematic knowledge about the *processes* by which beliefs, values, and attitudes concerning the world outside the United States are *formed and changed;* as we take account of the *nonschool and nonclassroom forces* which daily impinge on the individual learner (extracurricular activities, community, socioeconomic status, family, peer groups, and mass media); and as we accept the longitudinal implications of a *developmental approach to personal growth,* then the quality, location, and arrangement of learning experiences can be better tailored to the individual's changing motivation, age, role, and life situation.

Second, we seem to be moving (too slowly, perhaps) from a narrow definition of the international content of education conceived as a technical specialty toward a globalized curriculum centered on the study of social man in his entire earthly habitat—from a separate discipline to a broad perspective diffused throughout all learning, where reference to other than our own culturebound experience is appropriate and necessary. Parallel to this is a still uncompleted reconceptualization of what education is and where it occurs. The world outside the classroom is becoming accepted as an infinitely expandable laboratory in which to learn, not just to learn about.

The first two trends merge and conduce to a third, increasing recognition of the need for an overarching framework from which to derive criteria for, and means of, globalizing education. Emergent elements of this framework are: (1) more precise objectives (e.g., a shift of emphasis from what is "foreign," exotic, or we/they differences, to the concept of a common fate shared by all of mankind); (2) a system of continuous assessment and evaluation of educational effectiveness; and (3) the formulation of a coherent national strategy for providing a sufficient level of resources and support services consonant with long-term educational objectives.

For too long, too many different individuals, groups, and organizations attempting to "improve international understanding" have gone their particularistic, uncoordinated, and competitive ways. The present series exemplifies a new mode, for it is cooperatively produced by the International Studies Association, the American Political Science Association, and the Center for War/Peace Studies.

March, 1972 RICHARD C. SNYDER

Global Dimensions in U.S. Education: The University

By Maurice Harari

I. THE SETTING FOR GLOBALIZING U.S. GRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Remedies may vary but the diagnosis is clear: U.S. graduate international education is beset by a crisis of enormous conceptual, organizational, and financial proportions. A combination of circumstances, ranging from the backlash of U.S. involvement in Indochina to the pressing demands for educational reform and relevance, has deepened the crisis in the early 1970s. The economic recession, the uncertain marketability of graduates, and major domestic issues have increased student skepticism about careers in traditional international studies. Outwardly, a streak of neo-isolationism seems to be sweeping over our student population.

That this is a surface phenomenon disguising the highly idealistic and universalistic outlook of many creative young people is not sufficiently recognized. The real danger is not in the inward-turning or apparent lack of interest in international education; it is that the basic causes of disenchantment over the traditional objectives and patterns of international education remain unidentified and unheeded. No one contests that the overall crisis is severe or that the malaise may deepen in the next few years. Yet the United States now has a new and unique opportunity to assess and adjust its international educational resources and programs and thereby make a major contribution to the long-term objectives of world education and development.

The time has clearly arrived to work on stocktaking, reconceptualization, and better communication, a task with no precise deadline and involving a wide range of participants. The burden cannot be placed in the hands of a single individual or even a task force. What is required is a sustained and far-reaching series of efforts engaging teachers, students, researchers, educational administrators, university leaders, foundations, government agencies, and the many individuals concerned with formal or nonformal educational relations between societies—all of these and many others will need to work within their spheres of competence to strengthen U.S. resources and performance in international training, research, and public service.

This paper will identify some of the key issues and trends in selected major areas of international education. Value judgments implied and recommendations advanced are meant to focus attention on significant issues and to suggest possible refinements of objectives and programs.

The Semantics of International Education

"International education"[1] is an all-inclusive term encompassing three major strands: (a) international content of curricula, (b) international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research, and (c) arrangements engaging U.S. education abroad in technical assistance and educational cooperation programs. As Professor Butts says:

> . . . international education may be thought of as embracing the programs of activity which identifiable educational organizations deliberately plan and carry out for their members (students, teachers, and closely related clientele), with one of (or possibly both) two major purposes in mind: (a) the study of the thought, institutions, techniques, or ways of life of other peoples and of their interrelationships, and (b) the transfer of educational institutions, ideas, or materials from one society to another.[2]

Such terms as "international studies," "international programs," "intercultural programs," "transnational programs" are used widely and in some cases interchangeably. Other terms such as "foreign area studies," "non-Western studies," and even "international relations" are used to describe part or all of the international dimensions of education. A popular label adopted by a number of organized efforts is "international-intercultural," which ensures the inclusion of cross-cultural processes within a national as well as international context.

We will use the terms "international education," "international studies," and "international programs" interchangeably and in their broadest possible context. Our terms are meant to include cross-cultural and intercultural educational processes which have more than a strictly local significance and for which a transnational dimension can be established through a comparative or other approach.

In our view the three strands—(a), (b), and (c) above—identify the major substantive aspects as well as strategies for globalizing education. The term "international studies" accents the content side of such fields as area studies, international relations, and comparative politics, but the connotation of "international programs" is more than content and includes activities involving organized institutional relationships as well as the movement of scholars and students across national boundaries for teaching, research, or development. This latter activity should result in the enrichment of the curricular content and a wholesome diffusion of the global dimension in teaching and research.

The Evolution of U.S. International Studies

At the turn of this century, U.S. scholarship dealt with European society mainly in the context of diplomatic history and international law. The Asian areas were left to oriental classicists, and except in world history courses, there was little curricular interest in Africa. Budding Latin American studies did not survive the retrenchment which followed World War I. It was not until Fidel Castro, dubbed by some the patron saint of Latin American studies, emerged in Cuba that the systematic, multidisciplinary study of Latin American societies gained academic credibility and financial support.

Between the two world wars the international content in U.S. colleges and universities was largely in the history curriculum. Coures in international relations proliferated, but were conceptualized in the context of imperialism and power politics, with an essentially Western emphasis. There was little attempt to focus systematically and in depth on the dynamics of non-Western societies. The integrated development of non-Western studies made little progress before World War II, despite the fact that a rising number of our students and teachers traveled around the world and foreign students came here.

Being more flexible, U.S. foundations responded earlier than government to the need to broaden international studies in U.S. higher education. The Rockefeller Foundation pioneered with over one million dollars in grants between 1934 and 1942. Carnegie gave some $2.5 million in vital support of non-Western studies between 1947 and 1951. Since 1952, the Ford Foundation alone has granted over $300 million in support of area and international studies.

During World War II, the U.S. government asked a number of universities to assume responsibility for the intensive training of military personnel in language and area studies, and some 60 institutions helped train over 15,000 men. The postwar assumption by the United States of enormous world responsibilities, in the face of the contraction of the colonial powers and in the context of the Cold War, created a demand for U.S. specialists conversant with the language, culture, and social dynamics of a formidable array of hitherto relatively unfamiliar societies. The Truman Doctrine of 1947 signaled the irrevocable commitment of the United States to international involvement. The Marshall Plan in 1948 and the Act for International Development of 1950 were followed in 1953 by the university contract system engaging entire universities in technical programs overseas. The International Cooperation Administration was created in 1955 and was renamed the Agency for International Development (AID) in 1961, the same year in which President Kennedy set up the Peace Corps. By 1970, AID had contracts totaling $189 million and involving 66 universities in technical assistance programs overseas.

Under the impact of sputnik in 1958, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), primarily to strengthen U.S. scientific education in the face of Soviet competition. Under Title VI of the Act, language and area studies were to receive a relatively modest share of the large sums allocated. Gradually, however, the number of NDEA language and area centers grew (to 107 by 1971) with thousands of young men and women benefiting from NDEA fellowships for study and research in these U.S. centers and abroad.

The Fulbright Act of 1946 enabled thousands of Americans to engage in teaching and research activities overseas. Foreign students came to U.S. campuses in increasing numbers each year, reaching a record level of 137,000 in 1971. While before World War II very few American students engaged in study abroad, now more than 30,000 are participat-

ing through some 600 organized programs. In the 1930s there was only a handful of specialized language and area studies programs, but by 1970 there were more than 500 organized programs at almost 200 colleges and universities.

Through 1967, when its International Training and Research division closed down, the Ford Foundation had granted $271 million in support of area studies through universities, fellowships, or intermediary organizations. By the end of 1962, 15 major universities received ten-year support grants of $45 million. In 1965, $72 million was awarded as university-strengthening follow-up grants. Eleven universities[3] received major Ford Foundation support for both foreign area and other international studies. The purpose was to undergird the nation's resource base by producing the personnel and research necessary to the competent discharge of U.S. international educational and service responsibilities. Major area studies centers at prestigious institutions consumed the enormous external funding needed to train, assemble, and organize the necessary expertise. The teaching of exotic languages, the acquisition of library materials, and above all, the costs relating to the training and research components required considerable financial outlays and overseas travel.

To diffuse the international dimension within the institution, it was essential to create an administrative locus for services, international communication, negotiations with government and private agencies, and leadership. Universities had to look at themselves as total institutions as they sought to develop sound and coherent international programs. The pumping of external funds into salaries, research, travel, administrative backstopping, and the development of substantive content, became a test of institutional commitment to the international aspect of education.

The Nature of the Crisis

The university community had responded to the need to strengthen the international content of the curriculum and to requests from the U.S. government invoking the national interest. Understandably, this response created or exacerbated tensions between area studies and the traditional disciplines, between area studies and international relations or comparative studies, and between international studies and the humanities on one hand and the professional schools on the other. The accent on contemporary foreign societies alienated many faculty members and sometimes entire departments. The heavy involvement of certain U.S. universities overseas met with opposition and skepticism within several intitutions. Smaller educational units, especially those limited to undergraduate levels, charged the government with funneling most overseas programs through a limited number of large institutions—typically of the land-grant variety. The relative ease with which some universities accepted or sought complex commitments overseas, without ensuring their potential for delivery, and the subsequent impacts on their campuses created severe tensions within universities as well as between the government and the U.S. universities.[4] In addition, the foreign institutions involved often had their own unrealistic expectations.

Substantively and organizationally, the U.S. was experimenting. Universities were learning from their mistakes, scholars from the experience of their colleagues in other fields. Workable interinstitutional arrangements[5] multiplied at an extensive rate, though not always without serious obstacles and some disillusionment. In short, U.S. academia had adopted willingly a series of fundamental and revolutionary changes in curricula and services. What was desperately needed in the late 1960s and early 1970s was a period of consolidation, of diffusion, and of adjustment to a rapidly changing environment. Sustained financial support, spreading beyond the elitist institutions selected by the private foundations, was needed to capitalize on the momentum and build an academic structure somewhat less vulnerable to the vagaries of external finance. An impressive procession of educators strongly urged congressional committees[6] to provide a decade of critically needed support. Funds were presumably to be provided by the International Education Act of 1966. Not only was the Act never funded, but it was followed by a sizable decrease in the funding of Title VI of NDEA as well as of the State Department's Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays). To compound the crisis, such giants in the private sector as the Ford Foundation turned away from the support of international studies, partly in anticipation of the substantial funds[7] which the International Education Act promised to pump into the undergraduate and graduate sectors of U.S. higher education. As the president of the Ford Foundation stated:

> This Foundation has had no more solid and substantial undertaking, over the last fifteen years, than its program in International Training and Research. Through this program the Foundation has committed more than $270 million to the support of international studies in American universities, to national fellowship programs, and to other activities which might strengthen our national capacity to learn and teach about far parts of the world. Together with others, we have wrought a revolution: the study of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America—above all the study of Russia and China—has become a necessary, built-in element of the American academic establishment. Intellectual fashions being what they are, these studies will have good times and bad. But they are here to stay.
>
> So now we want to take our men and money to the next table. That table may be marked urban studies, or population, or Negro opportunity, or art—the particular area is less important than the fact that sooner or later a foundation really must move on.[8]

This is the character of the financial crisis besetting international studies in U.S. higher education today. The withdrawal of major funding from public and private sources finds most international programs on U.S. campuses extremely vulnerable because of their dependence on external funding. Salary lines, administrative infrastructures and a variety of other expenditures have not been integrated in central budgets, either because of internal resistance or because of the expectation that separate identification was an essential basis for generating external funding.

Several observers feel that the area studies interdisciplinary enterprise has not been sufficiently successful organizationally, and has not always yielded the expected integrated training and research. Students conversant

with foreign areas and cultures have resulted, but the more ambitious objective of integrating knowledge and disciplines has not. In times of relative abundance, these externally supported efforts were accepted, or opposition was subdued. Now that their financial underpinning is in jeopardy, the very concept of an area study is increasingly questioned within the academic community in organizational as well as substantive terms.

The administrative infrastructure supporting international programs on university campuses also finds itself in danger. The academic community had begun to appreciate the value of creating a center of administrative service and guidance on international programs within the institutional structure. This center was expected to operate on an institution-wide basis and beyond. The dean, director, or coordinator in charge assisted in institutional planning and in harmonizing the several international programs in which the typical U.S. university engages at home and overseas. More than 200 deans and directors of international programs[9] are now operating in such a capacity on university campuses, as opposed to a mere handful a few years ago. On many more campuses this responsibility is fragmented and perhaps less effectively discharged by administrators and scholars who lack systematic information and a point of policy coordination at senior university leadership levels.

International studies are also threatened on substantive grounds. Their content, purpose, and relevance to the changing world environment are being questioned. The tremors within the structures of higher education, resulting in part from the prolonged exertion of U.S. military power in Indochina, seem to have yielded a slackening of interest in traditional international studies. The community of teachers in international studies often finds itself alienated from the policies of the government; yet that same community is looked on suspiciously by students who are similarly critical of U.S. foreign policy. The international studies community is indeed strained and is simultaneously subject to two pressures: one is the call for the reform of all of higher education and its structures; the second results from the vulnerable position of many international programs because they have not been genuinely integrated into the substantive—or financial—core of the university. Additionally, U.S. international studies are challenged to promote a more effective global collaboration among the various existing national educational resources, of which the United States is only a part.

While the challenge is enormous, there is no justification for despair. On the contrary, the rapid and intensive immersion of U.S. higher education in international programs is now clearly ready for a major payoff. We know much more about foreign societies than we did 20 years ago; the universalization of several of our disciplines and fields has progressed to the point where we can venture more profitably into comparative and topical studies; we have a greater appreciation of the complexities of integrating knowledge through interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches; we have a respectable though limited cadre

of professionals conversant with the intricacies of educational development; and we are increasingly sensitive to the interrelationship of the problems confronting the United States with those of overseas societies. Our internal churning about reordering our national priorities is bound to have a healthy impact on the formulation of sounder, more relevant, and more effective international programs.

International Programs as an International Education Resource

It might be useful to underline the assertion that U.S. international programs represent a valuable international educational resource for the benefit of world society, including the United States. A few quantitative illustrations might be in order:

(1) The United States has about one fifth of all institutions of higher education in the world and trains about one third of all the students engaged anywhere in postsecondary study. The U.S. national system employs about one third of the global professional talent engaged full-time in teaching. It has over 500 centers devoted primarily to the study of foreign societies and a multitude of curricular offerings in those disciplines and professional fields which carry significant international content.

(2) The United States is currently training over 137,000 foreign students representing approximately one third of all the students in the world studying abroad. Of these 137,000 about 60,000 are at the graduate level and may be expected to fill positions of significant responsibility in their home societies, especially in the less developed countries.

(3) The U.S. higher educational system is engaged in about 240 technical assistance programs in less developed countries. Despite the change anticipated in the pattern of U.S. aid and U.S. educational cooperation with other countries, the U.S. national system of higher education will remain a major world resource in the future. Of more significance, the U.S. higher educational system is a lever with enormous potential impact on the total relationship of U.S. society to the problems of economic and social development overseas.

It is clear that the United States has tremendous potential for contributing directly and indirectly to world-wide problems of education and development. It is equally clear that the U.S. international studies community represents the most significant cluster of experts available for assisting in the conduct of U.S. relations with other societies and for influencing governmental policies through public education, the business community, and the media.

How Internationalized Is U.S. Higher Education?

A comprehensive review recently undertaken of the international programs of American colleges and universities sadly reports:

> The major findings of this investigation have been that international studies are still largely underdeveloped on most college and university campuses and that even the present levels of activity (to say nothing of urgent needs for improvement) are in serious jeopardy due to financial, organizational, and other difficulties.[10]

There has been impressive progress in the internationalization of the curriculum, and yet it is still possible for about 50 per cent of the graduates from one of our finest and most committed universities, the University of Wisconsin, not to have had a single course including significant international content.[11] The proportion of the graduates able to maintain their parochialism is even greater in other institutions with less involvement in international programs. Also, despite the deep involvement of U.S. professional schools in technical assistance projects overseas, it is evident that the international dimension in these schools requires careful planning and strengthening.[12]

Is there adequate justification for globalizing U.S. higher education, in view of the efforts and investment required? Fortunately, for many the desirability of world education is accepted as an article of faith. But that is insufficient for others. Our fundamental assumption is that a transnational approach to training, research, and problems of development will, at the very minimum, contribute to greater international understanding. A genuine awareness and appreciation of the dynamics of different cultures and of the interdependence of mankind should contribute significantly to the identification of world problems by students and to the mobilization of world support for the solution of real and menacing issues.

Furthermore, it is recognized that a genuine understanding of the intellectual and traditional background of another culture is an excellent way to sharpen the understanding of one's own. To be able to set one's own cultural heritage in a global context is certainly an asset on either an intellectual or practical plane.

Finally, there is a significant moral dimension which can be absorbed through world-oriented education. That dimension has to do with the revulsion that any member of the human race who lives in relative abundance should have at seeing the starvation and illness of his fellow man resulting from lack of food or elementary health care. That dimension has to do also with ensuring minimal standards of dignity for man, and a certain degree of freedom of choice through education and its application to the solution of critical world problems. A system of education which ignores the major problems of most of mankind is not acceptable; a system of education which does not lend its competence to the identification, analysis, and alleviation of the woes of mankind is not acceptable either.

The globalization of higher education is an objective worth substantial effort in planning and investment of resources. To be sure, there are value judgments inherent in this approach. These judgments are that peace is preferable to war, that the reduction of international tensions is a good thing, that the interdependence of the world necessitates a multinational attack on world problems, that the dignity of persons must be respected, and that education can lay the foundations for a better quality of life everywhere. We are confident that these minimal value preferences will stand the test of universal inspection.

Our concern with international programs of higher education is not only legitimate but necessary. Experience has shown that the globalization of education does not take place of its own momentum, but requires sustained application and leadership. It is hard to conceive that we could remain unconcerned with that dimension of education which inculcates a world perspective and a genuine awareness of the dynamics of intersocietal relations. The long-term purpose of education can easily be defeated if the proper world literacy and professional competencies are not nurtured simultaneously. Much will be wasted if we do not collaborate more effectively across national boundaries on refining the objectives and strengthening the processes of international programs of higher education.

II. THE CONTENT AND INTERFACE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

There is no rational scheme for the current compartmentalization of disciplines in higher education. Disciplines and departments have emerged as structural conveniences to organize generally related knowledge and to pursue it intellectually. Departments gradually acquired the power to admit faculty members to the jealously guarded guild and to promote them to tenure. Labels have stuck, vested interests have deepened, and gaps in communication have resulted between equally dedicated teachers and researchers. As the amount of knowledge grew in geometric progression, standard fields of study gave birth to numerous subfields. New strategies of organizing knowledge were created, including interdisciplinary programs.[13] Especially in the social sciences, the "scientific validity" of particular disciplines was increasingly questioned. Some claim that international relations or area studies are not sciences but strategic arrangements for organizing teaching and research. The tensions between the humanities and the social sciences are a matter of record and the tensions among social science subfields are increasingly disturbing. Far from being resolved, these tensions are deepening, and the lack of interaction between the social sciences/humanities complex on the one hand and the professional fields on the other is making higher education increasingly vulnerable to attack from within and without. This is especially so because many are no longer satisfied with the generation of knowledge for knowledge's sake, but demand that scholarship cope with threatening world problems.

It is not surprising, therefore, that international studies are in the crosscurrents besetting the evolution and compartmentalization of higher education. Each discipline and professional field should have international content. The globalization of social science and of all fields of study should be a legitimate and attainable objective. We may even now be on the threshold of a globalized social science. It should not be demanded

of any particular individual that he devote his energies simultaneously to teaching, research, and to the application of knowledge around the world. Different skills should be cultivated by different individuals, but the ultimate welfare of society requires a reasonable degree of interaction between interested and competent individuals normally engaged in graduate and postdoctoral educational pursuits.

To be sure, the international studies community is fragmented; so are its subfields, such as area studies, comparative studies, and international relations. Our definition of international studies encompasses the international dimension of all disciplines and professional fields, as well as interdisciplinary programs. A discussion of whether or not international studies constitute a conventional field would not be profitable here. Despite the fuzziness of its boundaries, it is a legitimate intellectual domain of inquiry. It would be more useful to select two or three key policy issues relating to the current status and potential of international studies and point our comments and recommendations accordingly.

Area Studies and Subfields of International Studies

Conceptually, organizationally, and financially, area studies and subfields of international studies present U.S. higher education with formidable and urgent problems. The single most important is the financial retrenchment afflicting all international studies. But the financial dilemma is compounded by substantive and organizational issues.

As previously noted, the generosity of private foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation, gave impetus to the creation and strengthening of graduate area studies in the United States, on the premise that these centers represented an essential national resource. In 1958, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) permitted the gradual entry of government into the support picture for language and area centers. By 1971 over 500 area studies centers existed in the United States,[14] with over 107 supported by NDEA funds, but their financial future is precarious. The International Education Act of 1966 was expected to pump $200 to $300 million into international studies over a three-year period. Partly in anticipation of this massive governmental entry into the field, and partly as a result of reordering its program priorities, the Ford Foundation terminated its generous grants in support of area studies and indicated that it would confine itself in the future to highly selective situations (e.g., support of Russian studies at Columbia and Harvard) or to new areas insufficiently provided for in the past (e.g., West European and East European studies).

The Ford retrenchment, the slashing of NDEA funds, and the nonfunding of the International Education Act caused deep anxieties in educational circles and encouraged a reordering of priorities. Questions which are increasingly being asked include:

(1) Is the structured area study concept of the last two decades suitable for the 1970s? Should the U.S. university invest further resources in area studies centers or should it strengthen its disciplinary departments? How

can the gaps between area studies and other subfields of international studies be bridged? In planning a university institutional development in international studies, what are the alternatives to area studies?

(2) Have certain area studies gained enough momentum (e.g., Russian studies) to justify giving priority to other areas (e.g., African, East European, Chinese studies)?

(3) What is the national need and marketability for trained area specialists? What is the level and breakdown of the demand by educational institutions, government agencies, business, the media, private organizations, others?

(4) What is the current national landscape in area studies with respect to (a) numbers and quality of centers which exist (per foreign area), (b) the projected national need, and (c) availability of teaching staff and library resources?

(5) What is the potential of comparative and topical studies as opposed to traditional area studies?

(6) In view of limited resources, how can U.S. universities achieve a rational division of labor to eliminate duplications and fill critical gaps?

(7) How can area studies be made more relevant to the development process overseas? How can area studies in the U.S. collaborate with area studies in other societies?

(8) How can area studies contribute more effectively to public education?

This questioning of the role and future of area studies is illustrative of the malaise felt by those concerned with the support and vitality of international studies. NDEA Title VI appropriations for language and area studies were $15.3 million for fiscal 1970, $8 million for fiscal 1971, and back up to $15.3 million for fiscal 1972. The possibility that support for fiscal 1971 might have been nil was quite real, and it took an enormous amount of last-minute lobbying to achieve even the $8 million appropriation. NDEA is categorical legislation, concentrating on language and area studies and not on the other subfields of international studies. Major support for the latter would have been forthcoming with the funding of the International Education Act.

The international studies community has been increasingly puzzled by the problem of how to broaden the financial base of support for international studies without reducing congressional support for language and area centers through NDEA Title VI. There has been the fear that too much tinkering with existing NDEA legislation might kill it altogether. It was not until the legislative process for fiscal 1972 was under way that the appropriations allowed for minor but promising variations from the standard NDEA language. Six new graduate programs were provided at an average cost of $40,000 each. These were to focus on such fields as contemporary Europe, East-West relations, international trade and business, and comparative urban and environmental problems. Also provided for were ten new undergraduate programs at an average cost of $30,000 each, with a distinct accent on teacher education in world affairs and international studies.

The Ford Foundation reviewed and affirmed its decision to consider most of its previous long-term grants in international studies as terminal. Columbia and Wisconsin universities received additional support, at lower levels for shorter periods of time, with the understanding that these were transitional to other sources of funding than Ford or to absorption by the central budgets of the universities concerned. Ford support of graduate area studies was clearly not to be maintained, and the transitional grants were obviously designed to prevent catastrophic collapse. Universities had to face the definitive termination of most of Ford's largesse in international studies. It became all the more important to press for government support, to work with state legislators, to cultivate the business community, to eliminate marginal courses, and to develop greater interinstitutional collaboration.

Above all, the commitment of the university to international programs was on the line: would the university absorb into its core budget hitherto externally supported programs? This is a supreme test of commitment, made all the more difficult by the very critical financial crisis besetting all institutions of higher education.

At institutions where area studies had been created with the support of business grants or integrated from the beginning in the central budget of the university, these programs were relatively safe. It was mostly at the undergraduate levels, however, that there was no reliance on external support, and the basic conditions described above remained true for most of the graduate programs in the country.

The temporary success of the NDEA constituency was encouraging but left no one with illusions. The more basic questions, formulated earlier in these comments, had not been dealt with, and there was no certainty that NDEA support would be continued indefinitely or without substantial modification. And non-area studies educators committed to international studies still did not know how to make the best case for support of overall international studies without appearing to attack the legitimacy of area studies. There were a few sustained attempts to discuss seriously the reconceptualization of international studies, and these illuminate the nature of the field and the resources needed to effect meaningful change.

The International Education Act of 1966 stipulated that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the assistance of the National Advisory Committee on International Studies (NACIS) would prepare a report for the President and the Congress containing specific recommendations for carrying out the provisions of the Act. In early 1967, to facilitate the work of NACIS, a number of papers were commissioned by Dr. Paul A. Miller, then the Assistant Secretary for Education primarily responsible for the implementation of the International Education Act when funded.

Experts prepared 11 papers relating to graduate area studies on a geographic basis, ranging from Africa to Latin America, including some pertaining to China, Japan, and Korea. Another 13 papers were also commissioned relating to work at the graduate level in the professions and

academic disciplines, and on other topics.[15] This set included, among others, papers on "Comparative Politics and Government," "International Politics and Foreign Policy," "International Law and Legal Studies," "Social Development and Cross-Cultural Studies," "Comparative Public Administration." Also included were such topics as "Education and Human Resource Development," "Population Studies," and "Urban and Environmental Studies."

The writers were asked to evaluate the "condition of their field" and to point to desirable directions and consequent need for support under the International Education Act. They were encouraged to review their assessment and recommendations with colleagues, which they did through seminars in different parts of the country, and through extensive telephonic consultation. This was by far the most comprehensive attempt to prepare for governmental entry into the substantial financial support of international studies. It was generally assumed that NDEA Title VI would eventually lapse and that its programmatic content would be taken over by the HEW authorities responsible for the implementation of the International Education Act.

The reluctance of Congress to fund the International Education Act after it became law in October, 1966, had a profoundly negative effect on the morale of the academic community. The latter had participated eagerly in a series of meetings and had prepared to formulate all sorts of institutional plans. More than 30 papers were finally prepared, but the lack of financial and organizational support prevented their integration into a reordering of national priorities in international studies. As valuable as these papers were then, it is inevitable that time will diminish their usefulness.

In October, 1967, Education and World Affairs, with the assistance of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, organized a "Seminar on the Future of International Studies." Twenty individuals representing area studies, comparative studies, international relations, and relevant disciplines were invited to assess the status of the field and to review the existing institutional and organizational machinery with respect to its ability to support recognized intellectual objectives. The findings of the seminar, still relevant almost five years later, are partly reproduced bel

> International studies consists of many types of scholarly activity, some with direct relation to each other, some with little relation yet demonstrated, leading to collaboration between some scholars in the field and to little, if any collaboration between others.
>
> Cooperation across disciplines has been rare: international studies has proven multidisciplinary, rather than interdisciplinary. Cooperation between subfields of international studies has shown some strength: comparative studies relies on many of the findings of area studies, but there is a definite need for developing linkages between comparative studies and international relations.
>
> There appears to be a divergence between generations of international studies specialists. The older generation has been preoccupied with the development of theory; the younger shows an intense interest in the relevance of theory to practice. There has also been a marked variation of international studies activity

in the various geographic regions of this country. Certain regions support highly developed centers of international research and training; other regions have yet to demonstrate more than a potential for strength. There is a definite responsibility for the advanced centers to assist the developing centers of international research and training.

Genuine collaboration of international studies scholars across national boundaries has yet to develop: American scholarship exercises an unhealthy dominance. Independent national competence should be encouraged, for there can be little transnational cooperation when there are few scholars overseas with whom Americans can cooperate.

Collaboration Between Scholars and Policy Makers

Mutual expectation of scholars and policy makers are somewhat distorted. Scholars have yet to develop an understanding of how policy decisions are made; policy makers have yet to develop an understanding of how scholars conduct research. Scholars expect direct access to data from the government and opportunities to publish research findings based on this data. Policy makers expect international research relevant to decisional needs: they, above all, are seeking information relevant to predicting foreign affairs events, and international studies has yet to produce predictive capabilities. (An example was given from strategic studies: scholars did not foresee that the possession of nuclear weapons would turn out to provide less rather than more flexibility in international relations, that the possession of nuclear weapons does not necessarily increase the relative power of a state in world affairs.)

Data Collection and Dissemination

International studies data have been accumulating with amazing rapidity, but there is yet no system available for the location and dissemination of existing knowledge. New constructs should be built on the basis of already established findings, but cumulative consolidation is difficult without systematic access to what has already been accomplished.

Regretfully, here again the financial and organizational climate did not prove propitious to a fruitful follow-up of the consensus developed.

This background is illustrative of the substantive and social complexity of the vast and fluid field called international studies. It may also assist us in appreciating the need for an organized social base and a catalytic point of leadership. It is interesting to note, for example, that both the International Education Act and the National Foundation for the Social Sciences Act (proposed by Senator Fred R. Harris) originated in Washington rather than in the academic community. The developments surrounding both pieces of legislation underscored further what had been noted in John Gardner's[16] review of the relations between AID and the universities: a sustained and substantive dialogue between the government and the academic community was badly needed.

One further point needs to be made with respect to the academic-governmental dialogue. It has to do with the tendency of some scholars to regard the scholarly community as the only sector capable of deciding the priorities for research in international studies. As long as practicing administrators and policy makers are not consulted or do not make their views known, there will continue to be a severe failure of communication. There is the glib accusation that social science research has not

helped governmental policy in any major way in the last two decades. As extreme and controversial as this statement might be, both governmental officers responsible for decision making and academicians agree that the hiatus between them is wide and deplorable.

It is important that the scholarly community understand and even experience the practitioner's role in government, so that the criteria of practical relevance and available options may be taken into account by scholars as they order their priorities and pursue research. In turn, the harassed government officer needs to learn more effective ways of utilizing detached scholarly expertise in those patterns in which the scholar functions best—reflective long-term assessment of trends and review of goals and options.

There is a reasonable chance that a more positive attitude on the part of all concerned with constructive, substantive, and sustained scholar-government dialogues will result in more relevant research designs and more interdisciplinary approaches to international problems. Successful interchange should also develop in more effective long-term assessments and planning and a broader consideration of options. We are aware of the difficulties which hamper the proposed dialogue; we recognize that there have been attempts with only limited success in the past, but the absence of such dialogue will have a more tragic consequence than the rediscovery of personal rigidities or professional intransigence.

Future Content and Organization of International Studies

We now return to some more practical comments on the current pattern in content and organization of international studies, to suggest possible directions for the future.[17]

It is suggested that the quantitative zenith of area studies has been reached and that their viability as an organized process of education needs careful qualitative overhauling. Lest this be misunderstood, we should underline our conviction that knowledge about and experience with foreign cultures will continue to be a critical need of the United States—indeed of all nations in the world. Our reservations have to do with the quantitative needs for manpower trained in area studies as well as with the desirability of change in the content of such training. We do not equate a descriptive and factual knowledge of foreign areas with a genuine understanding of the interrelatedness of world problems and societies. A foreign area literate, like a literate in any discipline or professional field, may be educated but may remain a world illiterate.

The reduction of professional personnel in most government agencies, foundations, and nongovernmental organizations is also a factor. Possible exceptions are the international organizations and the business community. In the latter, however, area study training tends to command a lower priority than other professional skills, and the marketability of area studies people is not likely to improve greatly with a stronger economy unless the training involved undergoes some qualitative changes as well.

With respect to changes in content, the following might be helpful. First, graduate area studies need to pay much greater attention to the preparation of teachers at the undergraduate levels as well as at secondary and elementary levels. This implies a responsibility for involvement in the whole range of content and approaches at precollegiate levels, and special collaboration and interaction with schools of education.

Graduate area studies should also exert effort in the direction of assessing the new needs of the business community, the media, governmental, nongovernmental, and international organizations. Such an attempt to relate more realistically to the market would have a wholesome impact on the content and organization of area studies.

Perhaps more difficult than any other change for area studies will be their relatedness to world problems which may or may not be of critical importance in the geographic or cultural area of concentration. The topical and comparative approaches may find built-in obstacles in a narrowly conceived area study approach, but this need not be so in all cases. The extent to which area studies can find bridges to comparative and functional approaches will determine the strength of the area study concept. A problem-focus or comparative approach may improve the methodological tools of teachers and researchers. Such approaches should certainly be more stimulating and relevant to a generation of students inclined to be skeptical about many aspects of traditionally organized international studies.

The foregoing suggests a much closer collaboration in training and research than presently exists between international studies, including area studies, and the professional schools. In some universities a good deal of flexibility exists in programing for graduate students across departments and schools, but research and development collaboration on an institutional level between area studies and the professional schools is scarce indeed. A university may have professional school faculty pursuing a project overeas under an AID, World Bank, or foundation contract, without any interaction with colleagues who are expert in the social sciences and the humanities of the society where the project is taking place. It is interesting to note, for example, that 86.9% of the area studies programs are at institutions not having technical assistance programs in the same geographic region (Table A)[18] while only 44.4% of the technical assistance programs are sited in institutions which have area studies in the same geographic region (Table B).[19] But even when area studies and technical assistance programs relating to the same region are housed in the same university, interaction is dismally deficient.

One of the major implications which emerges for the future conduct of international studies is that systematic efforts and innovations are needed to increase collaboration and interaction among subfields of international studies. Professor Rosenau recently addressed himself imaginatively to this and related issues and offered eight recommendations relevant to what he calls the discipline generalists:

> (1) The sanctity of the traditional boundaries between social science disciplines should be honestly reassessed, with a view to altering the incentive

TABLE A

Area Studies Programs of U.S. Colleges and Universities and Their Coincidence with Technical Assistance in the Same World Geographic Regions, 1967-1968*

World Geographic Region	Area Studies Programs at Institutions Having Technical Assistance in the Same Geographic Region		Area Studies Programs at Institutions **Not** Having Technical Assistance in the Same Geographic Region		Total Number of Area Studies Programs	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sub-Saharan Africa	8	13.1	53	86.9	61	100
East Asia	5	6.8	68	93.2	73	100
South Asia	11	21.2	41	78.8	52	100
Southeast Asia	3	23.1	10	76.9	13	100
Europe	5	3.9	122	96.1	127	100
Latin America	35	26.1	99	73.9	134	100
Middle East & North Africa	0	0.0	36	100.0	36	100
North America	0	0.0	5	100.0	5	100
Oceania	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	100
Worldwide & Country Varies	1	5.6	17	94.4	18	100
Total	68	13.1	453	86.9	521	100

TABLE B

Technical Assistance Programs of U.S. Colleges and Universities and Their Coincidence with Area Studies in the Same World Geographic Regions, 1967-1968*

World Geographic Region	Technical Assistance Programs at Institutions Having Area Studies in the Same Geographic Region		Technical Assistance Programs at Institutions **Not** Having Area Studies in the Same Geographic Region		Total Number of Technical Assistance Programs	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sub-Saharan Africa	21	45.7	25	54.3	46	100
East Asia	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	100
South Asia	18	39.1	28	60.9	46	100
Southeast Asia	3	10.3	26	89.7	29	100
Europe	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100
Latin America	57	62.6	34	37.4	91	100
Middle East & North Africa	0	0.0	16	100.0	16	100
North America	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Oceania	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100
Worldwide & Country Varies	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100
Total	106	44.4	133	55.6	239	100

* Source: Data Bank, International Council for Educational Development, June, 1971.

structures that have sustained the disciplines and even to according legitimacy to interdisciplinary teaching and research.

(2) Problem-oriented research projects should not be viewed as incompatible with basic and comparative inquiry, but rather as research sites in which to test and revise hypotheses and models.

(3) Language and area specialists should be recognized as indispensable to progress in the search for general patterns, and sustained efforts to build bridges to, and then capitalize upon the availability of, such specialists should replace pervasive disdain for them.

(4) In order to build bridges to area specialists, discipline generalists should occasionally apply their skills and quantitative techniques to particular aspects or problems of an area, thus demonstrating that the gulf between the two approaches can be narrowed.

(5) In developing new data sets for the field, stress should be placed on time series and on data that are descriptive of the structure and activities of supranational as well as national entities in the international arena. Greater efforts should also be made to gather data on the attitudes of decision-makers and elites.

(6) Discipline generalists should be readier than they have been to translate their theories and findings into readable texts that can be used at the secondary school and college levels.

(7) While not overselling the utility of their research products and advice, discipline generalists should continuously seek to indicate how their work is relevant to and provides a perspective for the problems faced by the society and its government.

(8) Either through the International Studies Association or some other appropriate organization, the case for the discipline generalist in international studies should be energetically and continuously pressed on the society and its public officials.[20]

Another implication stems directly from the relative scarcity of resources and the imperative need to increase interinstitutional collaboration among universities which are trying to preserve the quality, sometimes the existence, of major area studies. We cannot afford either the flagrant duplications or gaps which currently exist in area studies. Some winnowing needs to take place. Initiatives in the direction of greater interinstitutional collaboration and an appropriate division of labor would be far more advisable than attrition without planning. Interinstitutional collaboration can take several forms and need not be limited to a new pattern of relationships among the giant institutions in graduate area studies.

We would not want to load international studies with an impossible set of responsibilities, but we are not satisfied that international studies have adequately explored their potential relationship to world problems such as population and urban environment. The paucity of interdisciplinary research and teamwork needed for serious study across disciplines and professional fields has been inhibitive and prohibitive. Considerably more funds must be made available for data generation and analysis, for cross-disciplinary work, for transnational research and collaboration. These objectives are not pursued easily in the organized university setting of today. The desirable course of action seems to us to be that of simultaneously pressing for flexibility and reform from within while experiment-

ing with possible patterns and innovations without. Both of these courses need to be pursued vigorously to overcome the natural resistance to change which is often inherent in the setting of educational institutions.

On a transnational collaborative level it is interesting to note that there is almost no multilateral institutional collaboration, particularly in area studies, among several of the more developed societies and the less developed country which happens to be the focus of a particular area study program. Even if the total resources available internationally for a single geographic area or a functional problem remain static, it is safe to assume much greater effectiveness and substantive results in selective multinational collaboration than in the traditional bilateral relationship. Only in 1971, for example, were leaders of Latin American studies programs in Europe moving effectively toward closer collaboration among themselves.[21] Multinational collaboration among U.S.-Latin American studies, European-Latin American studies, and Latin American societies themselves is a target only beginning to be understood. There is also a potential array of multinational arrangements involving developed and developing countries. Through such cooperative institutional experiences another highly meaningful process would be strengthened—that of cementing professional collaboration among individuals with different nationalities and cultural backgrounds but with common goals.

Summary Recommendations

To identify issues and comment on trends is not easy. To draw definitive conclusions and to describe detailed actions with respect to this vast and complex field is far more exacting and will not be attempted here. We will try to summarize and list on a selective basis a few broad recommendations pointing to what appears to us to be desirable initiatives and directions for strengthening the process and objectives of graduate international education:

(1) U.S. international studies are at a critical crossroad. Evaluation of past performance is lacking, and clarity on future goals and directions is even more conspicuously absent in the face of a fast-changing domestic and world environment. An overall design for the future for such a vast and amorphous field does not appear to be either practical or feasible. A series of reconceptualizations of major components of the field could prove to be very fruitful, however, provided these several efforts reflected deep appreciation of the interdependence of societies and of the world realities challenging the survival of the human race. Such reconceptualizations will be particularly meaningful where they involve individuals beyond the traditional international studies scholarly community—e.g., representatives of the policy-oriented fields, the business community, and the media. Indeed, the world attitudes and collaborative arrangements which need to evolve are such that the process of reconceptualizing U.S. international studies should not be conducted in an "American-village" context, but should involve intensive consultations with appropriate individuals from other countries and cultures.

(2) The tensions which presently exist among international studies subfields and the rigidities of certain institutional structures combine to

oppose desirable multidisciplinary training and research as well as fruitful interaction between such scholars as those in area studies and those in subfields of international studies. University administrators, scholars, students, and funders need to build bridges and to create interactions among subfields wherever possible. The elimination of all tensions among subfields of international studies is not possible—it may even be undesirable —but there is room for more effective communication, for strengthening the knowledge content through interaction between subfields, and the generation and utilization of multidisciplinary data in relation to teaching, research, and problem-solving.

(3) Interinstitutional collaboration in international studies, especially graduate area studies, is necessary. Transnational collaboration in area studies involving several developed and developing countries and including the geographic area under study should be encouraged and given a problem-solving component when feasible. Greater collaboration is advocated among graduate international studies in the social sciences, the humanities, and the professional schools. Donors and administrators, as well as scholars, have a major responsibility to see that the collaboration recommended here is built into university projects overseas in the planning, implementation, and evaluative phases.

(4) The content of international studies in general, and area studies in particular, needs to be made more sensitive and responsive to world problems through comparative and topical approaches. The world and comparative dimension of critical domestic issues needs to be identified and studied whenever possible. Without sacrificing the virtues of theoretical research and training, it is possible and advisable to exert more effort in bridging the hiatus which often exists between the generation of knowledge in a specific area and its use for policy and development purposes.

(5) With specific reference to area studies, special attention should be given to diffusion and the adaptation of the content involved to undergraduate and precollegiate training, as well as to the broad purposes of public education.

(6) As fast as circumstances permit, international studies which are now dependent on external funding need to be integrated into the core budget of universities. The commitment of the leadership of educational institutions is imperative and must accompany the reform in content. The long-term process of seeking financial support for international studies is essentially the same as that of seeking support for quality education. The necessary cultivation of state legislatures, federal agencies, business, foundations, and international agencies must be shaped accordingly to ensure the long-term viability of international programs.

III. AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

This section will focus on critical issues and trends affecting the involvement of American higher education, principally U.S. universities, in educational development overseas. Our comments will provide a general informational background as well as suggest likely or desirable changes for the 1970s.

First, a few words on the quantitative aspect of the institutional involvement of U.S. universities overseas. Practically all of that involvement in what is being increasingly referred to as "technical assistance in education" is post-World War II, inaugurated with the Point Four Program in 1949. In 1953, the International Cooperation Administration (the predecessor to AID) had 22 contracts for overseas technical assistance involving 20 U.S. universities. By 1959, there were 89 contracts with 53 universities and a gross expenditure of $86 million. The dollar peak was reached on June 30, 1968, with about $204 million, involving 149 contracts and some 70 universities. A drop to 119 contracts, 66 universities and $189 million dollars as of June 30, 1970, reflected the cuts in appropriations for technical assistance purposes.[22] Additionally, there was the lesser involvement of universities overseas in projects sponsored by foundations such as Ford and Rockefeller, as well as by other agencies, national or international.

The qualitative dimension of these university relations overseas, especially in the less developed countries, is harder to assess. That much good has resulted from these is hardly debated, except by confirmed cynics. Yet we have experienced a sufficient mix of partial successes and failures, of unpleasant repercussions and surprises, to justify a careful assessment of the elements which make for successful planning and implementation.[23] As Dean Jack A. Rigney of North Carolina State University put it:

> Most U.S. universities are seeking ways to make their own programs more international or universal in scope, and there was an earlier hope that this might be achieved in part by allowing their faculty to participate in technical assistance programs overseas. This hope has been poorly realized in the experience of the past dozen years, and much of the reason lies in the inadequate role in which the advisor found himself.[24]

The complexities and ambiguities which surround technical expertise in the field cannot be minimized:

> Technical assistance takes three primary forms in the process of institution-building in the developing nations—participant training programs, capital input and technical personnel. The effectiveness of the whole process is in large part a function of the quality and magnitude of these three elements and of the skill with which they are managed and coordinated. The role which the participant training program and the capital inputs play in institutional development has appeared to be understood reasonably well by all concerned. There has been much confusion and difference of opinion, however, on what U.S. technical personnel are supposed to contribute and what they must accomplish by their physical presence that cannot be done more efficiently some other way.[25]

University involvements in overseas contracts result from a complex mix of motives and objectives. Theoretically, the goals are clear at both ends, with the dividends for the host country and the university identified and endorsed, and maximum feedback structured, taking into account broader social and political implications. This is seldom the case. In addition, a reliable measurement of actual impact is rarely achieved. Edward W. Weidner underlines some typical difficulties involved:

> After fifteen years of university contracting abroad, one fact is evident: the survey parties from most universities have been new at the process of foreign technical assistance in a good share of the instances. Consequently, they have not realized the importance of obtaining substantial data for benchmarks. They have concentrated on the immediate task at hand: recommending or failing to recommend involvement for their institution and specifying some of the conditions appropriate to such involvement. Project operation and evaluation have not been uppermost in their minds.[26]

The export of money and expertise across cultures remains fraught with danger, with the art not fully mastered by donor or recipient. In an essay entitled "A Perspective on International Development," John Hilliard highlights the self-questioning of most donors:

> Twenty years and 100 billion dollars later, the United States government is wondering what it bought for its foreign aid money and what lessons it can learn for the years ahead. So are the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the highly developed countries of Europe, and those private foundations able and willing to take a hand in the international development game. All are pretty sure they have not got just what they bargained for and are not sure they like what they got. Neither are the underdeveloped countries.[27]

It is not our objective here, however, to dwell on the successes and failures of technical assistance programs in education. Our record is apparently mixed, as is that of other countries which have been experimenting with education aid. U.S. universities may have erred in accepting contracts without assessing sufficiently their capability and commitment; wastages and frustrations have certainly occurred, but it is also clear that educational development has been furthered and that U.S. institutions have benefited from the transnational involvement of teachers, administrators, and students. Clearly, the effectiveness of this involvement could have been vastly improved, and the engagement of any U.S. university overseas requires regular review and refinement. Basic to the entire relationship is the fundamental question whether a university should involve itself at all. It is perhaps best to remember John Gardner's broad prescription:

> There has been much discussion of which overseas roles are appropriate to a university and which are not. We have emphasized that it must perform within the bounds of its own tradition and integrity. Beyond that it is not easy to lay down a general rule concerning 'proper' university activities overseas. Each university must settle that question in terms of its own character. . . .
>
> . . . It is fair to say, however, that the universities will probably achieve their most profound and lasting influence in working with their own kinds of institutions abroad—, or, to put it more broadly, in working to strengthen institutions for human resource development.[28]

We have learned from painful experience that universities should not play certain roles. Even when a national interest argument is accepted, it does not necessarily mean that the university must make itself available as the vehicle. National interest is an umbrella under which many activities have taken place which could have been conducted through other, more suitable channels. If these do not exist, the society should be sufficiently

inventive to create them or to strengthen alternate service instrumentalities. There is a critical and reciprocal responsibility in AID-university relations which must be accepted by both parties. The university must decide for itself what it should or should not undertake, and should not later accuse the government of forcing a questionable program through in the name of the national interest. Gardner's cautions of 1964 are still eminently valid:

> Virtually everyone in the university world would agree that there are certain short-term political tasks overseas that are incompatible with the university's role. For the university to undertake such tasks is inimical to its long-term effectiveness. With minor exceptions, the university must address itself to the achievement of long-term purposes: educational growth and human resource development, the advancement of knowledge, and the application of knowledge to basic problems.
>
> Nor is the university at its best in piecemeal assignments. Even if its assignment is limited, it should see that assignment in the largest context, i.e., the whole state of educational and human resource development in the host country.[29]

Our point, however, is that relationships successful in the 1960s may not be suitable for the 1970s. Overseas societies have been changing rapidly, as has our own. New situations call for new conceptualizations, objectives, programs, and mechanisms. The challenge to American higher education, in its engagement in international development assistance, is to identify equations that will be viable in the next decade. We stress this because of the enormous potential which institutional relations carry in the long-term process of internationalizing our curricula, our attitudes, and our programs. In the last analysis, however, whether under an institutional banner or as individual consultants, the individuals involved are scholars, administrators, and students, whose added experience and enlarged perspective will inevitably permeate their lives and careers.

The Pattern for the 1970s

What will be the nature of the relations between developed and developing countries in the 1970s? What can be said about the future viability of the traditional form of technical assistance?

PROPOSITIONS

(1) In the 1970s, traditional form of technical assistance in education across national boundaries will be difficult to conduct productively and will be increasingly shunned. Rising nationalism, pride, fear of cultural imperialism, and resentment against grants with visible and invisible strings attached will militate against the relationships which characterized the 1960s.

(2) Increasingly, universities all over the world will realize that in order to fulfill their mission they will need to adopt a universal approach to teaching and research. Whether in developed or developing countries, educational institutions of higher learning will obviously remain part of a national system of education, but will be as well an international resource for world education and development. National systems of higher edu-

cation will be more aware of the need to plan and strengthen the channels through which they might profitably cooperate. Such interaction might be structured between entire systems, or selected institutions, or departments, through collaborative research, the movement of scholars and students, international colloquia, or other means. These transnational linkages would seek to identify goals desired by the several parties and carry out the necessary implementation of these goals with minimum wastage/abrasion and maximum productivity/cooperation.

(3) The basic challenge confronting higher education anywhere, apart from the traditional issues of adequate financing and autonomy, is to become relevant to domestic needs and to a fast-changing world environment. Hence, educational systems and individual educators have a vital interest in collaborating more effectively across national boundaries in the discharge of their teaching, research, and public service functions. Hence, also, the logic of and need for promoting the types of institutional and professional linkages which strengthen the capability of individuals and educational institutions to deal with issues which have significance for the world, as well as for different societies, developed or not.

(4) The most productive arrangements in the next decade are likely to be those which incorporate: (a) genuine reciprocity between educational institutions; (b) a high degree of commitment, clarity, and accord as to the purposes of the arrangements and the means to be used to attain the desired goals; (c) competent management of the institutions involved; (d) a satisfactory mechanism for cooperative planning and evaluation; (e) increased financing from international or neutral nongovernmental sources; (f) maximum insulation from the fluctuations of the foreign policy of their countries; (g) a reasonable expectation of continuity to permit effective long-term planning.

(5) Consortia arrangements among institutions or departments in several countries will prove more satisfactory than sister-to-sister institutional arrangements.

(6) There will be a tendency on the part of the less developed countries to use individual and team consultants over which they will have control, rather than structured institutional arrangements.

The desire and need for more systematic and productive educational cooperation across national boundaries was affirmed by participants from socialist and nonsocialist countries at the quinquennial conference of the International Association of Universities held at Montreal, Canada, in September, 1970.[30] Both the Pearson[31] and the Peterson[32] reports strongly endorse the principles and obligations of international collaboration and greater internationalization of funding for international education.

University Responsibility for International Development Research and for Training Educational Planners

Research on the process of modernization is essential to the strengthening of international development programs and objectives, and universities and private research agencies are especially fitted to contribute to this pursuit. The unique strength of the scholarly community concerned with the development process must be exploited with a solid financial base undergirding basic as well as applied research:

> One cannot emphasize too strongly the role that systematic study, analysis, and experimentation must play in the evolution of improved methods of development assistance. We have a lot to learn. Research should address itself not only to the discovery of new knowledge, but to the devising, designing, and testing of new procedures and materials in technical cooperation, and to the analytical study—for purposes of improved decision-making—of development assistance activities and their consequences.[33]

Whatever the involvement of a specific university in overseas development, it is imperative that this incorporate research and evaluation. We have already alluded to the need for scholars in the social sciences and the humanities to team up with those in the professional schools to plan and implement overseas projects. Similar collaboration should exist for research related to the development process.

It has not been easy for the U.S. scholarly community to enter development research. This was due partly to inadequate financing and partly to an unfortunate lack of interaction between the scholars and practitioners involved. Despite some excellent work in this area, there still remains a glaring imbalance in the funding support for research as compared with the immensity of the problems of international development and the consequences of failure. As Hilliard stated:

> For the first thirteen years of U.S. aid to underdeveloped countries, the aid agency had no organized program of research in the phenomena of development. In 1963 it established such a program, with 6 million dollars in funds, or about .003 percent of the AID annual expenditure. Although this original amount has risen, it still bears no adequate relationship to the size of the expenditures for development. The international agencies and the private foundations have also given a low priority to research in the process and dynamics of development.[34]

Training, research, and applied work in human resource development are interrelated. The U.S. university has a legitimate though not exclusive claim to all three of these. The university community must have the commitment and financing to develop and maintain some centers of excellence at the graduate level for training and research on problems of education and human resource development.

One of the main issues to stress here is that the international studies community finds itself fragmented and compartmentalized when it tries to reconcile its traditional role of scholarly pursuit with the relatively newer role of university involvement in developmental problems. We believe that this dichotomy is frequently artificial and derives from internal bureaucratization as well as a gap in communication. The development process lends itself to wide participation and should draw on all scholars including the more theory-oriented. The stakes are enormous, and despite our experience to date, the challenges remain exciting:

> We are still in the opening phases of a new form of intellectual and practical endeavor. Perhaps the key unifying concept to have emerged is human resource development. It is clear that the development of human resources and the relationships between the development of human and of natural resources is a matter of supreme importance in bringing about planned change, whether in the developing countries, the urban ghettos or the wealthy suburbs.[35]

U.S. Foreign Aid in the 1970s

The United States now finds itself in a major revamping of its foreign aid patterns and structures, with consequences of potentially great significance for the involvement of U.S. higher education overseas. U.S. universities and private agencies have been functioning for 20 years or so as brokers and substantive instruments for U.S. aid related to education. In 1968, AID began to implement the Institutional Grants program authorized under the 211(d) section of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. The purpose of that legislation was to strengthen the capacity of educational institutions in the U.S. to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries. The first two grants made in 1968 were in family planning and population research, with $1 million going to the Carolina Population Center of the University of North Carolina and $400,000 to the Johns Hopkins Population Unit of Johns Hopkins University. As of June 30, 1971, 32 grants totaling over $23 million had been made to 28 institutions.

U.S. universities were also involved as institutions through the standard contract agreement in feasibility studies, institution-building, training, and other functions. Through institutional contracts, direct hire, training and research grants, the recruitment of teaching staff, and a variety of services conducted by U.S. universities and private organizations, U.S. educational aid programs involved American higher education quite extensively in overseas programs. Major changes in the pattern or level of government support for aid programs related to education would have serious consequences for the U.S. university community.

A series of significant reviews of foreign aid were completed at the end of the 1960s.[36] One landmark was established in 1969 with the *Report of the Commission on International Development.*[37] This commission sponsored by the World Bank, was headed by Sir Lester B. Pearson. Its recommendations that the contribution to development of each of the wealthier countries be raised to one per cent of their GNP by 1975, with an increasing proportion of these funds channeled through multilateral agencies, were generally in line with the broad directions recommended by many concerned with policy changes in U.S. foreign aid.[38]

In September, 1969, President Nixon appointed a Task Force on International Development, chaired by Rudolph A. Peterson of the Bank of America. The Task Force was charged with reviewing the Pearson and other reports, consulting with Cabinet members and key individuals concerned with development problems, and providing the White House with comprehensive recommendations on United States assistance to the less developed countries in the 1970s. The Task Force reported on March 4, 1970,[39] and recommended a larger U.S. contribution (although it did not specify one per cent of the GNP); complete separation of U.S. international development assistance from military-security programs; increased multilateralization of U.S. aid; and complete restructuring of the institutional framework conducting aid programs.

The Peterson Task Force also urged the termination of the Agency for International Development and the creation of several new instrumentalities: a U.S. International Development Bank to be responsible for making capital and related technical assistance loans in selected countries; an Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), already authorized by Congress, "to mobilize and facilitate the participation of U.S. private capital and business skills in international development"; and of special importance to the academic community, a U.S. International Development Institute

> to seek new breakthroughs in the application of science and technology to resources and processes critical to the developing nations. The Institute would concentrate on research, training, population problems, and social and civic development. It would work largely through private organizations and would rely on highly skilled scientific and professional personnel. It would seek to multiply this corps of U.S. talent and experience by supporting local training and research institutions. The Institute would be managed by a full-time director and a mixed public-private board of trustees.[40]

The Task Force proposed a U.S. International Development Council to "assure that international development receives greater emphasis in U.S. trade, investment, financial, agricultural and export-promotion policies." The chairman of the Council was to function under the broad foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State, but would be located at the White House.

Maximum initiative was to be left in the hands of the less developed countries, the U.S. financial contribution level was to rise, the U.S. role was to be supportive, and as internationalized as possible, and the number of AID-type personnel overseas was to be significantly reduced. Although it may prove difficult to separate technical from economic assistance in practice, we think the overall approach proposed by the Peterson group is sound and in keeping with the changing world scene.

President Nixon was clearly in favor of the general thrust of the Peterson recommendations, as witnessed by the tenor of his message to Congress of September 15, 1970, proposing a major transformation in foreign assistance programs. On April 21, 1971, the long-awaited legislation on foreign aid emerged from the White House and consisted of two proposed bills, the International Security Assistance Act and the International Development and Humanitarian Assistance Act. President Nixon asserted that taken together, these bills would:

> —Distinguish clearly between our security, development and humanitarian assistance programs and create separate organizational structures for each. This would enable us to define our own objectives more clearly, fix responsibility for each program, and assess the progress of each in meeting its particular objectives.
>
> —Combine our various security assistance efforts (except for those in Southeast Asia which are now funded in the Defense Budget) into one coherent program, under the policy direction of the Department of State. This would enable security assistance to play more effectively its critical role in supporting the Nixon Doctrine and overall U.S. national security and foreign policy in the 1970's.

—Create a U.S. International Development Corporation and a U.S. International Development Institute, to replace the Agency for International Development.[41] They would enable us to reform our bilateral development assistance program to meet the changed conditions of the 1970's.

—Provide adequate funding for these new programs to support essential U.S. foreign policy objectives in the year ahead.[42]

With specific reference to the U.S. International Development Institute, the instrumentality of primary interest to the U.S. academic community, the President's message clearly underlined a shift in the center of initiative in the direction of the less developed countries, thus emphasizing a changed modality in the bilateral aid partnership:

The new IDI would administer a reformed bilateral technical assistance program and enable us to focus U.S. scientific, technological and managerial know-how on the problems of development.

The Institute would engage in four major types of activities:

—It would apply U.S. *research* competence in the physical and social sciences to the critical problems of development, and help raise the research competence of the lower income countries themselves.

—It would help *build institutions* in the lower income countries to improve their own research capabilities and to carry out a full range of developmental functions on a self-sustaining basis. I would expect it to place particular emphasis on strengthening agricultural and educational institutions.

—It would help *train* manpower in the lower income countries to enable them to carry out new activities on their own.

—It would help lower income countries, particularly the least developed among them, to finance *advisers* on developmental problems.

Like the Corporation (U.S. International Development Corporation), the Institute would finance projects in response to proposals made by the lower income countries themselves. It would not budget funds in advance by country, since it could not know in advance how many acceptable projects would be proposed by each. It would look to these countries to select candidates to be trained under its program. Its research activities would be located in the lower income countries, rather than in the United States, to the greatest extent feasible. With its stress on institution building, it would seek to ensure that each program could be carried on after U.S. assistance is ended.

Most importantly, the Institute would seek to assure that all projects which it helps finance are considered essential by the lower income country itself. To do so, the Institute would require that the recipient country make a significant contribution to each as evidence that it attaches high priority to the project and is prepared to support it financially after U.S. assistance ends. We would finance a project for only a definite and limited period of time, and would want assurance that the host country would then carry it on. In the past, all too many technical assistance projects have been undertaken which were of more interest to Americans than to the recipient countries, and had little or no lasting impact. Our new program is designed to ensure that this does not happen in the future.[43]

The full implications of these changes for the scholarly and university community are quite profound and remain insufficiently realized. With respect to congressional approval of the new legislation, the proposed bills were destined for intense debate in late 1971 and early 1972, and indeed the very existence of AID was in jeopardy.

The foreign aid constituency was probably at its weakest in 1971, as a result of the recession, the press of domestic priorities, and the complexities surrounding U.S. disengagement from Indochina. The lack of apparent enthusiasm for the new Nixon foreign aid reflected much more these factors than support for the existing AID structure and its processes. Most well-informed Americans approved the new emphasis on functional capabilities and on the initiative and commitment of the less developed countries themselves. To translate this program into a three to five billion dollar commitment and to funnel much of it through multilateral channels, however, required concerted efforts and enormous consensus-building.

As Samuel P. Huntington persuasively points out, the most effective way to reform aid policies might be to focus on the goals of aid, shifting attention from politically negative connotations to ends more likely to have a positive appeal. The effort to develop a general constituency for foreign aid would cease, and special constituencies would be developed for particular foreign aid purposes. In Huntington's words:

> Except for those who oppose all forms of 'foreign aid' no matter what purpose it serves, little reason exists to talk about foreign aid as an end in itself. The discussion of policy should be in terms of, first, the desirability and importance of the goals which may be served by foreign aid, and, then, the relative effectiveness of aid as against other means for achieving those goals. Given the multifarious purposes to which aid may contribute, a 'foreign aid act' and a 'foreign aid agency' are clearly anachronisms. Current aid programs need to be disaggregated in terms of their purposes and new programs inaugurated to reflect emerging U.S. interests in global maintenance.[44]

Huntington identifies four goals of aid: (1) enhancement of the military security of selected countries; (2) encouragement of the economic development of the Third World in general; (3) promotion of the economic development of selected countries as one element of overall U.S. foreign policy toward those countries; and (4) encouragement of the emergence of pluralistic societies.

The international studies community should play a major and responsible role in the process of public education with respect to foreign aid and in refining the role of U.S. scholarship and educational institutions. The twin objectives remain those of assisting developing countries while enriching the U.S. educational experience. These objectives are far from incompatible, and yet the mutual points of reinforcement and reciprocity have not always been sufficiently explored and exploited.

The U.S. university community and AID were aware of the need to take a hard look at their relationship, and in 1970 a series of meetings resulted in a significant agreement,[45] prepared by a Joint Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and the Agency for International Development. The three broad conclusions reached by the Committee were:

> First, the universities and the U.S. Government share a strong interest in improving their understanding of the developing world and in cooperation between American and foreign institutes of learning. Second, the universities and AID can each serve their own interests through collaboration on suitable development activities. Third, the development field is rich in opportunities for the pursuit of a great variety of academic career specialties. All three

of these conclusions are founded upon a reciprocity of interests, and all three will become increasingly important.[46]

The understandings are most significant for the future, since they stress long-term funding and such important conditions for joint AID-universities operations as:

(1) a proper matching of the university and the overseas activity;
(2) incorporation of fuller joint planning;
(3) incorporation of improved program evaluation and feedback;
(4) ensuring flexible implementation authority;
(5) ensuring effective management by the universities;
(6) attracting qualified personnel;
(7) strengthening the ability of American universities to support overseas project activity;
(8) enhancing the capacity of host institutions to induce and sustain changes in the host country.

It was agreed that AID would experiment with a few projects embodying not only these broad principles but the detailed criteria later evolved through the new International Development Agreement. In late 1971, six such projects, largely in the field of agriculture, were under way involving AID, U.S. universities, and host countries.

On broader levels, the congressional actions which will probably be taken in 1972 with respect to the future objectives, patterns, and instrumentalities for U.S. foreign aid will be of enormous import to the U.S. international studies community. It is not certain that the proposed Nixon legislation will be authorized by Congress, with or without substantial modification, and equally uncertain is the level of funding to be subsequently appropriated for the various agencies. The pressures mentioned earlier tend to militate against generous foreign aid appropriations.

Summary Recommendations

(1) The U.S. international studies community is insufficiently mindful of the essential role it can play in relation to world-wide problems of development. One area where this community should exercise special responsibility, because of its expertise and status, is in public education on U.S. obligations and opportunities in international development.

It is recommended that the international studies community (a) support efforts to insulate long-term educational relations overseas from the daily fluctuations of foreign policy, and separate military security aid from development assistance; (b) support efforts to increase the multilateralization of U.S. aid and to view bilateral aid as supportive, with the major responsibility left to the developing country to identify its own priorities and organize its own resources; and (c) support efforts to raise U.S. development aid to one per cent of GNP as soon as practicable.

(2) The present fragmentation of the U.S. international studies community impedes the rich contribution which the U.S. can make to other societies, as well as to itself, in programs of education and human resource development. Especially to be promoted is greater interdisciplinary collaboration of scholars and problem-solvers across the widest possible range

of academic fields and disciplines. Also worthy of major attention is the illumination of points of convergence between so-called domestic issues and world-wide problems of education and development. The transferability and adaptation of experience and skills across national boundaries, and the application of comparative and topical analytical approaches to a number of significant issues can contribute greatly to bridging the enormous gaps which now exist between training and research on the one hand and the application of knowledge on the other.

(3) U.S. universities need to review carefully their rationalizations for being involved institutionally in development programs overseas. Each university or consortium needs to make certain (a) that it can justify its involvement overseas as an integral part of the pursuit of its general educational goals; (b) that its objectives are clarified to host institutions as well as concerned donor agencies; (c) that it has the commitment and capability to deliver the services expected of it; and (d) that it structures the maximum university-wide involvement and feedback.

(4) Traditional technical assistance programs need to be replaced wherever possible by cooperative educational arrangements accenting reciprocity of benefits and relevance to domestic priorities as well as to world-wide problems of education and development. Experimentation with new models and relationships more suited to present realities should be stimulated.

(5) U.S. universities should begin to prepare themselves for future relationships with international agencies, especially since an increasing share of development aid will be funneled through multilateral channels.

(6) U.S. universities should also plan their relationship with the proposed International Development Institute, especially since the primary initiative for identifying needs will rest with the developing countries.

(7) U.S. universities have a critical mission to train competent personnel for service in national and international agencies—private or governmental—concerned with international affairs, including education and human resource development.

(8) The U.S. international studies community has a major responsibility to stress its research contribution to the process of modernizing societies. Theoretical as well as applied research should be more vigorously pursued and supported in the future.

(9) Donors and administrators concerned with education and human resource development need to recognize the special and unique contribution the international studies community can make if it is encouraged to participate and be involved in the development of consensus on major priorities and methodologies. A continuous and effective dialogue is needed between U.S. policy-makers and the international studies community with respect to U.S. objectives and patterns of educational relationships with other societies.

IV. THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT OF EDUCATORS AND STUDENTS

While the interdependence of world society calls for multiple types of governmental and nongovernmental institutional networks, there is also the need for sustained and direct professional interaction between individual educators across national boundaries. There is no quick or easy

substitute for the professional camaraderie and mutual respect which usually develops when mature and competent people, from diverse or similar cultures, work together on a set of common problems.

As a principle, we need sustained efforts to build a strong network of international scholarly and professional contacts. These cannot always be nurtured within an institutional relationship and must be promoted on an individual level as well. Indeed, scholars and other professionals must be increasingly associated, in the minds of their colleagues, with professional competence in a field and integrity as scholars and as individual human beings, rather than with a particular institution or nation.

This section will concern itself with key issues in three selected areas: (a) U.S. research overseas, (b) U.S. teaching and consulting overseas, and (c) the training of foreign graduate students in the United States.

(A) U.S. Research Overseas

Recent U.S. social science research activities in the less developed countries have caused acute problems. These are by no means solved and issues now dormant may well explode later. While some U.S. scholars have been sensitized, through painful personal experience, to a variety of pitfalls (such as those surrounding Project Camelot),[47] the range of possible problems arising from U.S. research overseas is much more diverse. The total international studies community should be aware of these risks.

Despite the fact that U.S. social scientists justifiably feel that more funds should be available for overseas research, it is paradoxically true that there are already problems in different parts of the world stemming from the sheer massiveness of the presence of U.S. social scientists. These touch all levels, from senior and prestigious researchers down to eager predoctoral candidates, with fellowship funds, concerned primarily with gathering data for a dissertation leading to a degree from a U.S. university.

The technical and broad cultural complexities of field research in the less developed countries have been sufficiently identified[48] to permit better preparation of U.S. graduate students before they plunge into the field. We are concerned here with other factors, somewhat interrelated, which stimulate increasing resistance in different parts of the world to the presence of rising numbers of U.S. social science researchers. Klaus Knorr,[49] in a perceptive article, categorized the resistance encountered as due to five clusters of attitudes: (1) fear, (2) political hostility, (3) cultural sensitivity, (4) the exploitation syndrome, and (5) the saturation factor. This classification is convenient for structuring some of the comments below, but the issues could be described under other labels.

The fear complex has been heightened by the Camelot Project and the subsequent disclosure of a number of educational activities funded directly and indirectly by CIA or other "unclean" U.S. government money. Anything that might resemble intelligence research is rightly regarded with suspicion and creates a credibility gap between scholars of different

nations. Even private U.S. foundations found it difficult, sometimes impossible, to operate legitimate and locally needed educational programs following the CIA disclosures in 1967–68. Some foundations and some scholars were ejected; many projects had to be re-justified in relation both to their objectives and the purity of their funding source; and individual scholars have been hurt professionally, some irreparably.

A good example of political hostility in the 1970s is the ambivalent attitude of many Turks toward U.S. educational activities there. Despite the fact that Turkey is a NATO member and has been a traditional anti-communist society, the current brand of Turkish nationalism is distinctly anti-American. Students have demonstrated against the presence of an estimated 20,000 Americans on the payroll of the U.S. military in Turkey. The five major Turkish institutions of higher learning have been closed repeatedly as a result of student turmoil, including but not limited to anti-American issues. And the famed American-sponsored Robert College was nationalized in the fall of 1971. It is hard for an American scholar to teach in Turkey, but for him to undertake research, especially on sensitive topics relating to contemporary Turkish society and attitudes, is particularly unwelcome.

Two very complex questions which arise with government-sponsored international studies research, merely touched on here, are (1) the inaccessibility of such research to the wider academic community and (2) the coordination of research among the several agencies of government engaged in it. As to the former, there is a great need for communication about research in progress, for declassification of as much in-house governmental research as possible, and for a comprehensive and integrated information system. As to coordination, there has been steady improvement in the last few years in the exchange of information between government agencies and some working-level cooperation has been achieved on a voluntary basis, thanks to the efforts of the Foreign Area Research Coordination Group (FAR), created in 1964. The volume of research generated by the U.S. government is not negligible. In fiscal 1970 a dozen federal agencies spent more than $20 million on contracts and grants for foreign affairs research conducted by universities and independent research organizations. For further coordination, President Nixon created, in April, 1971, a Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs Research (USC/FAR), as an interagency committee replacing FAR. It has a secretariat in the Office of External Research and is part of the machinery of the National Security Council. Its purpose is to respond to the increasing emphasis on long-range research planning, more rational ordering of priorities, and allocation of resources and responsibilities among agencies. Only time and evaluation will indicate to what extent USC/FAR will succeed in achieving its objectives.

With respect to the exploitation syndrome, often referred to as "mining," the charge is often regrettably justified. It suggests that the primary intent of the researcher is in mining the data and then exporting that data out of the country without leaving behind duplicates or residues

to benefit the nationals of the country involved. At the very minimum, each foreign scholar should associate himself with a local counterpart or assistant who will participate in, contribute to, and benefit from the project. We strongly endorse the pattern of collaborative research scholarship promoted by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. A few countries are making the entry of foreign researchers conditional on this type of collaboration with a local scholar.

It would be highly advisable for U.S. scholars to adopt this formula voluntarily whenever appropriate, to enrich their project through local collaboration and thus enhance the prospects of future independent scholarships in the area. It is equally important for the U.S. scholar to structure from the beginning his "public accountability" to the society which extended him its hospitality. Data should be shared, reasonable services rendered (e.g., an occasional lecture or seminar on the progress of the research or within the scholar's field of specialization), scholarly contacts maintained after departure from the country, including copies of papers stemming from the field research.

Beyond these base guidelines, however, it is desirable that topics selected by outside researchers fit into the local research priorities of the host nation. This is the reverse of the laboratory approach adopted by those who look to a society only as a field site and have no genuine interest in contributing to the developmental aspects of that society.

Saturation or inundation takes various forms. In some small countries, expertise in research centers or elsewhere may be very limited. Even in some of the larger less developed countries the number of senior scholars with competence to discuss or assist a project conducted by external researchers may be small indeed. Thus, the large numbers of U.S. scholars working in the less developed countries may cause problems. Local scholars, administrators, and government officials, confronted with all these Americans motivated by intellectually legitimate goals, have a limited capacity to respond evenly to their visitors or to their inevitable questionnaires.

An issue transcending all the foregoing concerns is that of the ethics and integrity of the individual scholar.[50] Professional competence is essential and may be taken for granted, but it does not necessarily follow that a scholar will conduct himself ethically in all aspects of his relations with his overseas colleagues. The recent tremors in social science research, caused in part by a lack of ethics and in part by ignorance of the sources and conditions of funding, can be blamed on all—scholars, institutions, and donors. The international studies community must maintain the highest standards of professional ethical conduct. This ethical dimension, relating to educational relations with foreign societies, must permeate classroom teaching as well as research design efforts. This admonition is by no means limited to U.S. scholars but covers scholars of all nationalities.

Administratively and financially, enormous efforts are needed to

promote more effective patterns of research identification and collaboration, to vet research objectives and to ensure freedom of inquiry and the autonomy which characterizes the independent scholar. In the last analysis, however, standards of conduct for individual scholars, institutions, or donor agencies must be self-imposed. The need remains great for awareness of trends and issues and for better communication and interaction among those concerned with international research scholarship. Policing scholarly traffic and imposing sanctions is out of the question, but the value of general guidelines is increasingly evident. We should not wait for the next major explosion.

With respect to the responsibilities of the scholar himself, we wish to endorse the excellent set of recommendations prepared by the EWA Council on Educational Cooperation with Latin America and the Latin American Studies Association. The first 12 recommendations of this report[51] are worthy of the closest scrutiny by all concerned with the health of international social science research:

A. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOLAR AND THE SPONSORING ORGANIZATION

(1) Research proposals, where feasible, should be made known to local scholars for professional opinions on relevance to local research priorities and adaptability to local conditions. Feasibility is interpreted as meaning that there is a community of national scholars, or preferably, a scholarly organization; consultation with such an organization is preferable to that with a single scholar. The inquiry may be made by the individual presenting the proposal, or by the sponsoring agency, but the sponsoring agency should require such a review where feasible.

(2) Individuals initiating research in a country should include in their plans necessary briefings from senior scholars familiar with the local research scene. Such advice should be sought among scholars in the host country, in regional scholarly organizations and elsewhere. Grants should enable scholars to make the necessary briefing contacts.

(3) In cases where the inexperience of the scholar, or the complexity of the research task so suggests, scholars should make exploratory visits and supporting agencies should encourage them in doing so.

(4) Supporting agencies should determine what previous research the scholar has carried out in a foreign area, and with which institutions and specific scholars he had had research relationships.

(5) Although it should be internationally obvious, scholars should be discouraged by mentors, colleagues or granting agencies from undertaking research without language abilities appropriate to the research task and the proposed research relationships.

(6) The international scholarly community needs to develop more rigorous supervision of scholars-in-training. Students should, where possible, be associated with scholars-in-residence, either through the auspices of local institutions, or under the direct supervision of a responsible experienced scholar. No short-term research for students should be sponsored without a guarantee of responsible supervision.

(7) Supporting agencies have a responsibility to call constructively to a scholar's attention aspects of his activities which may suggest failure to meet responsibilities mentioned herein.

(8) Supporting agencies and scholars should give special encouragement to joint research and to the emergence of local clearinghouses of research to be located in scholarly institutions. It would be advisable for sponsoring agencies to solicit from investigators evidence of an agreement to collaborate prior to supporting proposals for joint work.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOLAR

(9) Scholars should offer and be willing to make themselves available to local scholarly organizations for informal teaching, lectures and other recognized modes of scholarly communication when so requested, providing that the activities do not seriously interfere with the central scholarly work.

(10) When the disciplinary area in which he is working is not well developed in the host country, the foreign scholar should, where possible, incorporate within his project the training of local researchers.

(11) The foreign scholar has the responsibility to communicate his findings periodically to the local scholarly community. Long-term projects (for example, of a year or more) should allow for interim progress reports. Upon terminating research in the country, the foreign scholar should make sure that the current status of his research findings is available to national scholars. Such availability might typically consist of a written progress report or, where feasible, of public discussions or other recognized forms of presentation.

(12) The scholar has a responsibility to the scholarly community within which he works to make sure that the findings of his investigations are available to that community. If such is indicated by the local scholarly community, this responsibility is not fulfilled until these results are available in the national language and located in a center where they may receive further distribution and be accessible to local scholars.

The involvement of some U.S. universities in intelligence-security oriented overseas research projects, shrouded in secrecy as to auspices and findings, is a grave distortion of a university and a disservice to the scholarly community of the U.S., as well as that of other nations. Senior administrative officers and trustees of U.S. universities must satisfy themselves that their institution is not involving uninformed U.S. or foreign scholars in research projects damaging to the goals of the university community. There should be no university project which does not permit a clear statement of the research objectives (eventually to be shared with the public) or the funding source.

(B) Teaching and Consulting Overseas

The need for foreign staff in some of the less developed countries, especially in Africa, will remain substantial in the 1970s. Conversely the involvement of U.S. faculty in overseas educational settings is potentially an excellent way to enrich our universities and colleges. Despite the convergence of these two objectives, U.S. higher education has not yet taken full advantage of the reciprocal benefits which should accrue through overseas experience for its academics.

It is safe to assert that placing competent faculty members from other countries in a university setting in a rich or in a developing country is an eminently worthwhile goal, whether it involves Oxbridge faculty in U.S. universities or Canadian faculty in East Africa. This is a highly desirable

and enriching practice which we hope will gain momentum. But we wish to stress here another need, that of universities in less developed countries (e.g., Zambia or Nigeria) for expatriate staff without which many departments will literally not be able to function—at least not in the next few years.

Earlier we mentioned the U.S. researcher overseas and the three labels under which he may travel overseas—as researcher, teacher, or consultant.[52] In the less developed countries a senior U.S. researcher may find himself being consulted as well as lecturing. A senior U.S. professor who teaches abroad almost certainly finds himself drawn into consulting and institution-building. The role separation which can be maintained in the U.S. fades away in a developing country environment, and this often enmeshes faculty with no interest or competence in the additional roles thrust upon them by their host countries.

The process of involvement in multiple roles is often gradual and complex, with responses dictated by a mix of cultural sensitivities and the need for help in the face of acute local shortages of resources. Yet, the U.S. scholar who may be drawn into consulting and institution-building overseas may never have had that experience at his home university and may not be equipped to play that role. In short, one field problem is the proper utilization of multiple imported competencies, which requires greater discrimination by local leadership as well as by U.S. educators overseas.

The need for effective matching of services needed with imported skills is increasingly accepted. As a general rule, educational institutions in the developing countries prefer to recruit the talent which they require, but these efforts are often frustrated by lack of supporting funds, lack of responsive administrative services in the developing countries, bureaucratic inflexibility, or a less than propitious climate for eventual reentry of faculty into their home society. The high degree of sophistication acquired by an ever growing intellectual and managerial elite in the less developed countries makes ludicrous and dangerous any relationship which smacks of paternalism. Local leaders want and should have consultants whose sole role is advisory. They also need competent teachers whose purpose is to teach. In some cases these two roles can be mixed, with the third role of researcher added.

If U.S. higher education is to pursue more successfully its twin goals of meeting the critical needs of formal and nonformal education in the less developed countries, and in that process enrich its own enterprise at home, it must shift significantly its attitudes, patterns of relationships, administrative arrangements, and funding.

U.S. faculty are presently recruited and placed overseas through a variety of instrumentalities which include: university-AID types of contracts; private foundations (e.g., Ford and Rockefeller); international agencies (e.g., World Bank, UNESCO, and OECD); direct hire personnel (AID); Fulbright programs and others. The fragmentation of U.S. donors and program sponsorship is compounded in the field by

other programs under other national or international auspices. What may have been at one time a welcome embarrassment of riches is now proving increasingly chaotic and distressing to donors as well as to recipients.

There is an important dilemma to be faced. If U.S. universities are to be the only source of U.S. teachers, in practice this limits the recruitment base to the 70 universities or so which have traditionally been the instrumentalities for AID contracts. How do the more than 2,000 other U.S. institutions of higher learning contribute to and become enriched by faculty exposure overseas? Faculty from liberal arts and community colleges should also be allowed to make their contribution. But a university should not hire "mercenaries" from other institutions to fill slots in a contract overseas. How then do we recruit those scholars, across the pluralistic institutional landscape of U.S. higher education, who desire to broaden their horizons through a substantial experience overseas and are badly needed in a variety of teaching posts in less developed countries?

The burden of identification and recruitment of U.S. personnel cannot be left casually to overseas universities with their limited resources and poor communication with U.S. higher education. While there can be a variety of brokers as long as arrangements actually add up to an effective delivery system, this is unfortunately not now the case. The university contract system does procure faculty for overseas, but as suggested earlier, encompasses only a limited number of U.S. universities, while the non-university private sector is terribly fragmented, nibbles at pieces of the important overall task, and is increasingly beset by dwindling financial resources and rising bureaucratic hurdles. In short, it cannot be said in the early 1970s that the U.S. has mobilized the necessary resources or devised the administrative mechanisms that could effectively relate U.S. higher education to the less developed countries for their reciprocal benefit.

The Senior Fulbright Program[53] has generally been beneficial and appreciated, but its goals and administrative and financial procedures need review. For example, the program should certainly cater more to the teaching needs of African education and stress reciprocal scholarly exchange. The quality of Fulbrightees can be improved, if the objectives and supporting arrangements of the program are strengthened. The Fulbright scholar usually has a one-year appointment and is considered a visiting lecturer at the host institution. What the universities in some LDCs keep stressing, however, is their critical need for qualified senior professors who will spend at least two years. They also need junior professors where local younger faculty are in short supply.

An increasing number of Fulbrightees should go for a longer sojourn overseas and to a mix of teaching and research. There should also be efforts to fit Fulbrightees into planned project approaches, possibly through interinstitutional arrangements and preferably accenting the reciprocal value of exchange. Sadly, Fulbright funding has been curtailed in recent years. We strongly urge increased allocations for the Senior Fulbright program with the proviso that substantive goals and administrative procedures be updated and related closely to current needs.

As to recruitment of U.S. professors outside the university-institutional system, there are a number of hurdles to be surmounted. In Africa, for example, topping-up[54] is needed for the differential between the local salary given an African professor and the higher level which the U.S. professor needs. Donor agencies must provide these sums or else the arrangement cannot be consummated.

AID is country- or project-oriented, and there are therefore many institutions of higher learning in Africa where U.S. faculty cannot be placed with AID funds. We do not mean to minimize the positive impact of AID funding where AID happens to have an institutional support commitment. But we do suggest the need for flexible funding for topping-up purposes from public and private sources which are now limited.

One additional element to be stressed in future planning and implementation of faculty placement programs is the need for more fruitful interaction between organizations concerned with operations and those which are policy-oriented. The picture is, therefore, one of a fragmented and inadequate response to a persistent set of needs. While it is difficult to elicit sound long-term local planning, it is certainly not possible without a more coherent mobilization of U.S. resources.

Having identified in broad terms the challenge confronting American higher education in relating more effectively to overseas needs, and its own consequent enrichment, we feel it might be useful to list briefly a few of the needs which confront us in the area of faculty service overseas:

—the need for universities involved in institutional development projects overseas to refine their goals and the subsequent exploitation of their faculty members who serve overseas (e.g., structure feedback, write up opportunity on return, outreach to undergraduates and precollegiate levels, and application of experience to U.S. conditions).

—the need for change in U.S. colleges and universities so that service overseas for a two-year period will not entail loss of fringe benefits or promotion.

—the need for systematic recruitment in a variety of professions and disciplines through new channels other than the major university institutional contract—i.e., a need to develop and strengthen a strategy of recruitment from four-year and two-year colleges and outside AID-selected universities.

—the need for careful screening of motivation and professional competence as well as sensitive cross-cultural orientation before immersion in a foreign culture.

—the need for flexible topping-up of funds from U.S. governmental sources, and a need for long-term funding and lead time for recruitment.

—the need for major rethinking of the Senior Fulbright program to meet more realistically the needs of the less developed countries.

—the need for greater interaction between American higher education and international agencies which increasingly require the services of appropriate faculty members across national boundaries.

—the need to ensure that the primary loyalty of a U.S. professor teaching overseas is to his host institution.

—the need for more flexibility on the part of donors and recipients to enable interested U.S. faculty members to combine teaching and research.

—the need for parity in the salary and benefits offered U.S. faculty of comparable seniority but serving under different auspices.
—the need to assist a U.S. teacher overseas in maintaining contact with developments in his profession and in reentry to the U.S. scene without penalty for having been away from the traditional promotion ladder.
—the need for U.S. donors, recipients, and brokers to develop greater coherence in relating to the educational development priorities of LDCs and in planning U.S. faculty service overseas.
—the need for U.S. donors, public and private, to promote increased collaboration with other donors and international agencies relating to the needs of the LDCs.

Our conviction expressed earlier, is that through teaching, research, and consulting overseas, the U.S. international studies community has enormous opportunities and responsibilities. The refinement of goals, the adjustment of the required transnational machinery, and the policy and financial support which are needed to undergird these efforts should command the attention of scholars, administrators, donors and service agencies.

(C) Foreign Graduate Students in the United States

A university in these times can only be considered a true university if its students and faculty are aware of the complex and manifold nature of the world and its peoples. The universities must, therefore, accept and welcome a commitment to this international frame of reference, and they must do so consciously as a means of realizing their fullest potential. They must accept the view that their students and faculty are not limited only to their country or region but belong to the whole world. It is only when they accept this international commitment, with all of its implications, that they can achieve the third and perhaps most important role of a university, which is the ability to serve the worldwide community.[55]

It is disconcerting, as we enter the 1970s that, despite our intensive involvement and experience with foreign students, we face more critical policy issues in this field than many care to admit.[56] On the whole the U.S. record has been good. We have trained millions and we have extended our friendship and home hospitality freely. Hundreds of agencies, national and regional, and countless private individuals have joined in an effort to make the total foreign student experience in the United States positive and meaningful. Yet pressing questions are now being asked.[57] Inevitably, the urgency of some of these questions comes from the crisis besetting our own values and institutions and the changing nature of our relations with the rest of the world.

These comments focus on the more than 65,000 foreign graduate students in residence in U.S. universities during the academic year 1970–71. This foreign graduate student "industry" has reached a cost, visible and invisible, of about one-half billion dollars a year. The social and cross-cultural impact of such an industry is gigantic at home and abroad and defies accurate measurement. Surely there is value in any attempt to maximize the positive contribution of this industry and to alleviate some of its negative repercussions. It is naive to dismiss the foreign graduate

student traffic by simply asserting "the more, the better!" It is equally negligent to take a laissez-faire position that "more and more will come anyway, so why worry about it?" Those who make such facile comments must be challenged on the assumptions they inevitably make and the issues which they seem to prefer to avoid. We very much hope that we are providing the best possible training, that more will be able to come, and that our institutions will be able to admit them. But are we sure that this is the case, and are we sure that we are admitting the right kind of student, for the right reasons, at the right level, at the right institution for the right kind of training?

1. Need for Institutional Rationale

Strange as it may seem, most U.S. institutions of higher learning do not have a clear rationale for the admission and training of foreign graduate students—or at least one integrated into overall institutional planning. When that rationale is missing or outdated, one finds the foreign student component left to fragmented interests on campus, without top policy support or genuine institutional commitment. In the absence of careful planning, decision-making for admission is divided among admission officers, departments, and other elements within the administrative structure. The quality and number of students admitted necessarily reflects the uneven character of this process.

The basic questions universities should be asking themselves, and should be able to respond to with confidence, are: (1) Why should foreign students be admitted? Is this an integral part of the planned international role of the university? (2) What are the criteria for admission? Specifically, what attention should be paid to (a) quality, socio-economic and linguistic background, (b) numbers, (c) areas of study, (d) financial assistance and (e) development priorities in their home countries? (3) Precisely where and what should the decision-making process be within the university? (4) What assessment should there be to measure the extent to which the expectations of the foreign students and of the institution were fulfilled?

A U.S. national policy for the admission and training of foreign students may be quite impractical and perhaps impossible. But the clarification of the policies of individual institutions is both feasible and vital, and must be part of the overall planning process of the university, of concern to the president of the institution and to its board of trustees. Increasingly, pressures from state legislatures and other quarters will escalate these issues to the top policy level, where they should have been examined in the first place. Only through clearly formulated institutional policies—based on reliable information, relevant needs, and opportunities at home and abroad—can a stronger U.S. national performance be achieved in relation to the foreign graduate student. Only such sound institutional policies will encourage funding agencies, both public and private, as well as a host of service agencies concerned with foreign students, to support the national effort which this sensitive field richly deserves.

2. The Curriculum

A recurrent theme in the training of foreign students is that of changing the curriculum. The subject creates immediate opposition on the part of those who assume that any such change would result in a two-track system of education, one for American and another for foreign students. This is not proposed here and would indeed be unfortunate. Equally regrettable, however, is the attitude of those who overlook needed changes and innovations in the curriculum, especially since change could be simultaneously beneficial to American and foreign students alike.

The internationalization of the curriculum is a mission to which we need to dedicate ourselves, not because we are training foreign students but because a quality curriculum is absolutely essential to students of all nationalities to enable them to cope with the realities of an interdependent world. Universalizing the curriculum requires expert attention, field by field. An engineering educator or a social scientist will not contribute much to the universalization of his specialty unless he makes a systematic attempt to include in his teaching and research comparative experience drawn from a variety of other cultures.

Infusion, comparative approaches, area study concentrations, and other such terms merely describe the variety of ways available to universalize the educational process. Our efforts to do this on a discipline-by-discipline basis have been insufficient, and we need renewed commitment, planning, and incentives. It may be fortunate that the existing pressures for change are in the direction of "relevance" and of "practical implications." This will tend to bring the U.S. curriculum closer to some of the needs of foreign students from the LDCs. There is ample room for innovation in a flexible curriculum. Many of our so-called domestic issues have parallels overseas and could be profitably approached on a comparative international basis. The range of existing possibilities to stimulate appropriate field experiences and research projects for foreign and American students alike has scarcely been tapped. We draw particular attention to three of the recommendations endorsed by a group which focused on the experience of Latin American engineering students in U.S. universities:

Recommendation 8

To the extent possible, the curricula of U.S. engineering schools should be oriented to the needs of developing societies. In order to accomplish this, data on the employment patterns and industrial needs of particular regions will have to be collected and analyzed. Alumni should be utilized as a source of such information.

Recommendation 11

At the graduate level a special effort must be made to encourage students to adopt thesis topics and research projects which relate to specific problems encountered in the developing nations. Latin American institutions should be invited to communicate their research interests and plans to U.S. colleges and universities so that thesis advisers could be made aware of these undertakings in the counseling of Latin American students.

Recommendation 16

U.S. engineering schools should view overseas alumni and professional associations as channels for communication with returned graduates. Through these organizations, educational planners in this country can monitor and evaluate the experience of returnees and in the process obtain valuable feedback on the quality and the relevance of U.S. professional study and practical training programs.[58]

3. Foreign Student Training as a Facet of Development

Our approaches to foreign students at the admission and training phases seem uncoordinated and disparate. At one end of the spectrum are those who believe in absolute freedom of movement of young scholars, unfettered by other considerations; at the other end, those obsessed by the imperative need to relate every step in the process to the manpower priorities in the country of origin. Our overall pattern of fellowship support seems to corroborate this dichotomy and sharpens the division. Different agencies of government tend to reflect these different approaches, and the impression is created that our fellowship policies are working at cross purposes, that U.S. governmental programs are not only unclear but perhaps whimsical.

Surely, this should not be an *either/or* proposition. There must be room in our society for the further training of a gifted young poet from a less developed country where poetry is not a high-level manpower priority. Not all investment in training need be tied strictly to development priorities; but neither can the latter be blatantly ignored and regarded as a narrow AID obsession.[59] The options between the two extremes are plentiful and insufficiently exercised. But we need reliable and up-to-date information centers overseas qualified to interpret the real capabilities of U.S. institutions—more specifically, which institution and at what level—to fulfill the expectations of the prospective foreign student. There is also an understandable lack of information on the part of the average admissions officer or department head in a U.S. institution on up-to-date development priorities overseas.

The foreign student is probably the richest mine in the long-term development process. About half of our foreign graduate students have been self-supporting or have the assistance of their governments. No more than 10 per cent are under U.S. government sponsorship. Irrespective of auspices, we cannot afford to overlook the developmental needs of their countries of origin. U.S. contributions, and other national or multinational investments in educational development overseas, are of such magnitude, and the need continues to be so acute that we cannot concern ourselves exclusively with those foreign students whom we assist financially. We must give serious attention to more effective recapture systems for institutions and countries interested in the return of their nationals studying or working abroad. We must be concerned not with rigid migration controls but with the encouragement of more attractive working conditions and the creation of appropriate incentives in the societies where the process of selection and admission for study in the United States started in the first place.[60]

4. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND PROBLEM-SOLVING

The core of our concern is the process we should adopt to tackle the issues involved in the foreign student field as well as in most areas of international education. We cannot continue unilaterally to identify and solve problems relating to the selection, admission, and training of foreign graduate students. We need more information, more policy planning, and more consultation overseas. We are not as sensitive as we should be to the full dimensions of such problems as they are perceived by our colleagues overseas. The selection and training of foreign graduate students is a key area demanding more enlightened and sustained joint consultation and problem-solving.

The policies of foundations and U.S. government agencies will be sounder if they can be based on a more coherent U.S. university rationale relating to the training of foreign graduate students—a rationale buttressed by up-to-date information, sensitivity to educational trends overseas, and a genuine collaboration with colleagues abroad in identifying and resolving issues. It is obvious that while each university must formulate and implement its own policies, no university has all the resources, communication linkages, and current national and international information needed. It is here that the supporting services and resources of private organizations and government agencies must be put more fully at the disposal of U.S. universities. Much closer collaboration and support in the United States among the public and private sectors is needed. Above all, we call for a more sustained dialogue with appropriate leaders overseas and for follow-up programs to relate U.S. higher education more significantly to world-wide problems of education and development.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

(A) U.S. RESEARCH OVERSEAS

(1) U.S. scholars, universities, and donors have major responsibilities to each other, as well as to the larger international scholarly community, in the professional conceptualization, funding, and ethical conduct of international studies research—particularly in the less developed countries.

(2) There is a need to promote the internationalization of U.S. social science research through increased international collaboration and funding.

(3) There is a need to promote communication and clearinghouse arrangements within the U.S., as well as on a world scale, relating to international social science research.

(4) The strengthening or creation of social science data banks in the less developed countries should be promoted and merits the cooperative attention of scholars from different societies, including local scholars.

(B) TEACHING AND CONSULTING OVERSEAS

(1) American higher education must undergo a significant shift in attitudes, patterns of relationships, administrative arrangements, and funding if it is to pursue successfully the twin objectives of meeting the critical educational needs of the LDCs and of enriching in the process its own enterprise at home.

(2) Multiple means for recruiting U.S. teachers and consultants need to exist, through university contracts as well as other channels. It is essential to involve suitable faculty members throughout the wide spectrum of U.S. educational institutions.

(3) Greater interaction is needed between policy-oriented agencies and operational agencies concerned with relating the educational resources of the United States to the needs of the LDCs.

(4) U.S. programs supporting recruitment of faculty for service overseas need careful review, more-flexible funding, more reciprocity, and more planning and continuity. Also needed are systematic efforts to improve the climate for recruitment, to ensure loyalty of faculty to host institutions, and to deal with reentry problems.

(5) There should be experimentation and flexibility in combining some of the functions (teaching, research, consulting) to be performed by qualified U.S. educators overseas.

(6) Also needed is the adjustment of U.S. higher education to the patterns of international auspices and financing which will characterize the 1970s as the LDCs assert primary control over the ordering of their resources and priorities.

(C) Foreign Graduate Students in the United States

(1) Universities need to assess carefully their goals and procedures in selecting, admitting, and training foreign graduate students.

(2) Professional and disciplinary departments need to concern themselves with the substantive adequacy of the curriculum for the foreign graduate student.

(3) On a national basis, the United States needs to exhibit a fuller appreciation and implementation of the training of foreign graduate students in relation to the development process.

(4) There is a need to promote a sustained dialogue between the public and private sectors with regard to foreign graduate students in the United States. National policies, fragmented or otherwise, need review. The understanding of state legislatures needs to be cultivated.

(5) There is a critical need to promote joint-problem identification and problem-solving with colleagues from overseas. A genuine degree of reciprocity needs to be established.

V. THE CHALLENGE

It is clear that the U.S. international studies community needs to internationalize itself. The problems being faced call for a recasting of the predominantly domestic or bilateral frame of reference into a genuinely multinational approach. The fast-changing world environment and the global significance of many domestic issues make this imperative. The future viability of U.S. international studies lies in being related meaningfully to training, research, and public service functions on issues of world significance. Our resources and potential are enormous, despite the financial stringency afflicting the field. We need a recasting of overall perspectives and goals, and a consequent review and refinement of strategies, processes, and instrumentalities. Only then will U.S. international studies, as an

integral part of world educational resources, command the respect and financing needed for the task. The preceding chapters we hope have illustrated the nature of the challenge. A few themes might now be usefully commented on.

Reconstituting the International Studies Community

Any implication that the international studies community was cohesive but became fragmented because of adverse circumstances is in error. There has been very little interaction in the past between the subfields of international studies or between the professional fields and the graduate social sciences and humanities. There never was a spokesman for the international studies community, and the constituency which that community aimed to serve remained fluid and diverse. Even the sparse leadership of the international studies field has been enormously diluted by the multitude of institutions, scholarly groups, and other organizations laying claim to a portion of the field.

Until a few years ago, the American Council on Education had an International Commission with only limited resources and little relationship to the scholarly community. Education and World Affairs, created in 1962, played a very useful role through policy studies and other services in strengthening international education in the United States, but unlike ACE it never had a constituency and its U.S. emphasis was inevitably diluted through its conversion in 1970 into an international private agency. The Institute for International Education, over 50 years old, remains the major national instrument for international education exchange. It does not deal with other facets of international education, which are numerous and complex; further, it is operational rather than study and policy oriented. An extended list of national organizations concerned with one aspect or another of international education on a geographic or functional basis only confirms a picture of excessive pluralism and diversification.

The same can be said, and understandably so, of a great many scholarly associations which tend to splinter rather than to merge or establish liaison and communication. Thus, despite the long existence of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, a number of scholarly associations concerned with area studies or development have emerged. Recently several area studies associations have begun to compare notes, but the disciplinarians, the comparativists, the developers have no sustained communication and interaction except perhaps under the hospitable but limited urbrella of such organizations as the International Studies Association or the Society for International Development. Also, U.S. universities fail to present a cohesive point of view and tend to speak through their individual presidents or through an array of associations with varying interests (e.g., the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the American Association of Universities, and the American Council on Education).

Similarly, private foundations have their own program perspectives and priorities. These generate activities which do not necessarily reinforce each other and which often reflect the desire of a foundation to make

its "unique" contribution or to alleviate a particularly difficult problem.

In short, there is no single spokesman for the U.S. international studies community and it is probably not desirable to have such an institutional or individual czar of international education. What can be aspired to, however, is greater communication and interaction between existing groups and the gradual evolution of a "broad consensus base." Such efforts should allow for:

(a) conceptual reviews of the future content and direction of each of the subfields of international education, and

(b) the inclusion in the new international studies community of a variety of professional and scholarly interests not now part of the traditional family (e.g., interests which relate to urban studies, ecology, race relations, and a variety of other world problems).

The fragmentation of U.S. government responsibility is even more dramatic. Nine different agencies[61] seem to have primary responsibility for international education programs, and about 25 other agencies have ancillary involvements. This fracturing is worsened by inadequate communication and interaction between these agencies. Interagency liaison committees have limited value, and coordinating committees are effective only if the leadership is capable of eliminating vested interests and implementing a clear and forceful policy through a multiplicity of complementary channels. For a complex of reasons, an overall, well integrated and executed international educational policy has not been the pattern in recent years. This is especially wasteful in a time of very limited financial resources for international education.

Public-Private Sector Relations

The picture we have shown is that of excessive pluralism in the private sector and division of responsibilities among U.S. government agencies concerned with international education programs. It is therefore not surprising that the private and public sectors have found it hard to conduct fruitful dialogue. It is also not surprising to find that the 1960s were replete with quests to define generalized goals for the private sector and attempts to effect liaison, or to coordinate scattered responsibilities, among an array of U.S. government agencies.

One theme that emerged repeatedly in the policy studies of the 1960s was the need for quasi-public agencies to act as the responsible brokers between the government and the academic community. Such agencies would establish policies, priorities, and appropriate channels for the disbursement of funds, and in some cases conduct basic and applied research. The need for these instrumentalities serving the public agencies and the private sector was dramatized by the disclosures in 1966–67 of CIA funding of certain international education activities. Recommendations ranged all the way from the creation of a National Institute for Education and Technical Cooperation (NIETC),[62] as a semiautonomous government institute, to the Center for Educational Cooperation, which was to have been set up within HEW, with a certain degree of autonomy, had the International Education Act of 1966 been funded. Precedents set by the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Sciences, the

Smithsonian Institution, and the National Endowment for the Humanities might suggest useful patterns for such a new agency.

It is to be hoped that a new locus of responsibility for U.S. government international education programs will facilitate better coordination and will be insulated from the fluctuations of U.S. foreign policy. This suggests that HEW, or a separate agency in which the international studies community is well represented, might be a logical candidate. It is important that there not be an artificial separation between our domestic and overseas international efforts. For example, the separate existence of an Institute of International Studies within HEW, of extensive educational exchange programs within the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, and of substantial development research and educational development cooperation within the International Development Institute (urged by the White House) is tolerable; but lack of communication and interaction between these agencies must not be allowed.

Optimally, of course, different agencies of government should derive their goals and consequent programs from an overall international education policy formulated by public officers and congressional committees which have engaged widely in interchange with educators as well as with such other significant sectors of U.S. society as the business community and the media.

In turn, however, the international studies community needs to reorder its own priorities and inject the flexibility and reform which U.S. higher education needs. This is essential to any dialogue with government and other sectors of U.S. society seeking more meaningful content. The nature of the international studies community, as illustrated earlier, makes it unrealistic and unwise to expect it to come up with a grand design for the reordering of national priorities. Nor is it practical to think in terms of one fixed design suitable for the 1970s, another for the 1980s, and so on. More to the point would be a continuous series of refinements of goals, strategies, and programs adjusting to a continuously changing environment. This requires a sustained effort at assessment, communication, and policy interaction, with the burden assumed by all leadership levels, including teachers or institutions in a position to innovate.

Creative changes can be generated by individual scholars and bold institutional leadership, as well as by judicious funding based on new ideas and existing expertise. Funding should not be limited, however, to trail-blazing innovations, and it would indeed be tragic to allow the current momentum generated in international studies to die. It is vital that all promising points of growth—programs and individuals—be encouraged. It is also essential that certain programs be maintained even if they do not fit the innovative rubric. It may be asserted simply and confidently that in such a large and complex industry as higher education there will always be programs which need to be maintained even if they have been in existence for a decade or two. The tests should relate to essentiality and quality rather than to newness versus tradition.

The Private Nongovernmental Organization Sector

The landscape is dotted with private nongovernmental organizations which perform services of one kind or another in international education. Counting nonprofit educational service institutions—but excluding colleges, universities, and the numerous scholarly and professional associations—adds up to over 100 U.S. organizations which operate partly or wholly in the international education arena. They include such older agencies as the Institute of International Education (founded in 1919) and the Experiment in International Living (1932), and those of later vintage, such as the National Association for Foreign Students Affairs (1948), the American Friends of the Middle East (1951), the African-American Institute (1953), and the Center for War/Peace Studies (1966). The services rendered range from administrative and logistic support of the international movement of students and scholars to technical assistance, language training, orientation, and curriculum reform programs.

This international education organizational subculture is set in the midst of an even larger group of voluntary local, regional, and national agencies which promote hospitality, an appreciation of cross-cultural exposure, and international understanding broadly defined. These groups are a boon to the effective and personalized conduct of U.S. educational relations with other countries, and are particularly helpful in implementing many programs which would otherwise have to be operated directly by U.S. government agencies, foundations, and universities. Yet, the private nongovernmental organization sector is deeply in trouble. The proximate reason is financial, but there are deeper problems which need to be noted.

Roles and Services

Functionally, the aggregate efforts of existing agencies show overlap as well as gaps, resulting in unnecessary wastage and duplication. In times of relative abundance the problem was repeatedly examined but never solved. Now that the financial squeeze is acute, it is reasonable to explore how the services could be more effectively discharged by fewer organizations, which would be adequately financed and could attract able leadership and staff. A certain degree of pluralism is part of the U.S. way of life, and a little competition is not bad, especially in the educational services field. Our view of tolerable U.S. pluralism, however, is seen as chaos by many educators and public officials overseas who have to deal simultaneously with dozens of representatives of different public and private agencies whose functions are overlapping and competitive. An ever more confusing situation faces our overseas colleagues when the competition is between programs funded by different U.S. government agencies.

Earlier, an attempt was made to show that the modalities in educational relationships between the United States and other countries needed basic changes to harmonize with the realities of the 1970s. The nongovernmental sector, therefore, also needs a major review of its goals and pro-

grams if it is to function effectively as an intermediary between government agencies, foundations, and universities on the one hand and overseas societies on the other. The institutional or program mechanisms which functioned well in the 1960s are not suitable for the 1970s. The disclosures of CIA involvement in certain educational activities clearly underscored the need for a systematic review of the overall needs and a matching of these needs with the capabilities of existing organizations. Organizations are naturally prone to accept any task helpful to self-perpetuation—there seems to be a natural law of organizational survival, to which there are few exceptions. Sometimes organizations pass away through financial debility, especially if they happen to be dependent solely on one or two funding sources. But occasional attrition does not necessarily mean that the overall field has been reviewed, reordered, and strengthened. In short, there exists a critical need for a review of the overall services which U.S. private nongovernmental organizations need to render in the 1970s and a consequent strengthening, modification, or phasing out of existing agencies.

The foregoing proposition is further strengthened by the need to plan systematically the nature and function of the supportive administrative services which U.S. higher education requires in overseas settings. It is probably in the interest of U.S. universities to farm out as much as possible to service agencies, in the United States as well as overseas, functions which do not necessarily have to be performed by the universities themselves. It is also relevant to suggest that in overseas societies a service base led by local staff or under international auspices should be favored over an agency which is a mere extension of U.S. higher education.

Financial Support

The immediate crisis in the nongovernmental organization sector, however, is financial. The overall cut in international education programs has meant fewer grants and contracts, and private foundations find it very difficult to reconcile repeated grant renewals to NGOs with pioneering for change. The business community has made many contributions to a variety of private educational service organizations but these have been far from sufficient to create a climate of solvency or reasonable security. The U.S. government has very little tradition in making grants to the NGO sector, and present relationships are largely contractual, with extensive negotiation about the level of overhead to be received. Each government agency contracts with an individual organization for a certain set of services at a certain cost plus limited overhead. The long-term programmatic and financial viability of the organization has not been the concern of government agencies.

As far back as 1966 the President of the Carnegie Corporation asked:

> Is the non-governmental organization of the future to be simply an auxiliary to the state, a kind of willing but not very resourceful handmaiden? Or is it to be a strong, independent adjunct that provides government with a type of capability it cannot provide for itself?[63]

This question also relates to the larger issue of quasi-public agencies functioning between the public and private sectors. We have no doubt that the U.S. government must make a greater contribution than at present to the private NGO sector, but we also must admit candidly that this desirable trend will depend for success on

(a) the reassessment of substantive needs, and the matching, strengthening, and winnowing-out process suggested herein, and
(b) the existence of suitable intermediaries between government agencies and the vast numbers of NGOs currently operating.

In addition, private corporate support should be increased, and this calls for mutual understanding between the business community and the NGO sector concerned with education. With the ever increasing U.S. business expansion throughout the world, it should be possible to make a stronger case for support by the U.S. business community on behalf of individual organizations or a pool of the most meritorious. Finally, international support has been very rare in the funding of the U.S.-NGO educational sector. Must this remain so, especially as some of the private agencies multilateralize their services?

Irrespective of the financial formula or level of support eventually reached, the first task is to create a climate of credibility and respect for an essential set of services to be rendered globally in order to strengthen international educational relations. We are confident that resources will rally as appropriate to the support and strengthening of a cluster of organizations whose functions and programs are recognized as essential to the vitality of international education in the 1970s.

The Outlook

To repeat the opening theme of this chapter, we are convinced that the most significant challenge confronting the U.S. international studies community is that of internationalizing itself—a process which calls for a systematic reordering of priorities. In fact, this is the theme which has run through our entire treatment of the issues dealt with in this paper.

We are highly optimistic that we can achieve our objectives because we have enormous resources and a record to build on. We are not persuaded that allowing programs to disappear through financial attrition is the most wholesome way of reordering the field. There is no adequate substitute for the academic community itself attempting to engineer meaningful changes in content and structure, in consultation with non-educators and appropriate individuals and institutions in the United States and overseas. We stressed throughout the need for reviewing priorities, and for better communication and more planning to harmonize with and even anticipate the changing world environment in the years ahead. The process is painful, but vital. The crisis in finance can be solved if we deal with the crisis in content. We must tackle the latter with the confidence that we can find appropriate solutions to different elements of a complex and multifaceted puzzle. The need is for systematic analysis, communication, and curricular experimentation. The task is substantial, but feasible and exciting. It calls not only for organization and hard work

but also for the unselfish participation of those seemingly vested interests which may appear to be most in jeopardy through the modification or disappearance of existing programs. It is gratifying to note, however, that there is hardly a leader in the field of international studies—vested interests or not—who does not accept the notion that major changes are due and are essential to the long-term viability of international programs. The purposes of this writer will have been more than fulfilled if the views expressed here contribute to the informational base on current trends and desirable directions, as well as to the agenda for discussion and action essential to the reform and long-term planning of education.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BRADEMAS, JOHN. *International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

GARDNER, JOHN W. *AID and the Universities.* A report from Education and World Affairs in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, 1964.

GLENNAN, T. KEITH. *The Professional School and World Affairs.* Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press (for Education and World Affairs), 1967.

GUMPERZ, ELLEN MCDONALD. *Internationalizing American Higher Education: Innovation and Structural Change.* Curriculum and Organization: Asian and African Studies. University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

HUMPHREY, RICHARD A. (ed.). *Universities . . . and Development Assistance Abroad.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

International Education Act. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-Ninth Congress, Second Session on S.2874, August 17, 19 and September 19, 1966.

MORRILL, J. L. *The University and World Affairs.* New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960.

NIXON, RICHARD M. *Foreign Assistance for the 'Seventies.* 91st Congress, 2nd Session, House of Representatives, Document No. 91–385.

PEARSON, LESTER B. *Partners in Development.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.

PERKINS, JAMES A. *International Programs of U.S. Colleges and Universities: Priorities for the Seventies.* New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1971.

PETERSON, RUDOLPH A. *U.S. Foreign Assistance in the 1970s: A New Approach.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 4, 1970.

ROSENAU, JAMES N. *International Studies and the Social Sciences: A Survey of the Status of International/Comparative Studies and Recommendations Concerning National Needs and Priorities.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: International Studies Association, June 1971.

SANDERS, IRWIN T. and WARD, JENNIFER C. *Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

NOTES

1. For an excellent review of the evolution and scope of the terminology "international education," see R. Freeman Butts, *America's Role in International Education: A Perspective on Thirty Years,* Sixty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, 1969).

2. *Ibid.,* pp. 12–13.

3. Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, M.I.T., Stanford, Wisconsin, and Yale.

4. John W. Gardner, *AID and the Universities,* a report from Education and World Affairs in cooperation with the Agency for International Development (1964).

5. For an informative evaluation of interinstitutional cooperation, see Shepherd L. Witman, *Inter-Institutional Cooperation and International Education* (Education and World Affairs, 1969).

6. *International Education Act,* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, August 17, 19 and September 19, 1966.

7. The International Education Act included authorized funding at the level of $40,000,000 for fiscal 1968 and $90,000,000 for fiscal 1969.

8. McGeorge Bundy, *The Ford Foundation Annual Report, 1967* (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1968), p. 7.

9. International Council for Educational Development, *International Offices on U.S. and Canadian Campuses: A Directory* (September, 1971).

10. Irwin T. Sanders and Jennifer C. Ward, *Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p. 225.

11. *Ibid.,* p. 16.

12. See T. Keith Glennan, *The Professional School and World Affairs* (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, for Education and World Affairs, 1967).

13. For a review of the semantics, meanings, and structures of intellectual efforts involving more than one standard discipline, see the interesting papers organized by OECD for its *Seminar on Pluridisciplinarity and Interdisciplinarity in Universities* (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, September, 1970).

14. For a detailed listing see *Area Studies on U.S. Campuses: A Directory* (International Council for Educational Development, March, 1971).

15. A special Task Force was also set up to review the needs at the undergraduate level with specific reference to Section 102 of the International Education Act.

16. John W. Gardner, *op. cit.,* 1964.

17. In formulating his views the author has benefited greatly from conversations in the United States and abroad with educators, foundation personnel, and government officers. He is particularly indebted to Professors Richard Lambert of the University of Pennsylvania and James N. Rosenau of Ohio State University, who have been respectively engaged in reviews on the status and future of area studies and of other subfields of international studies. At the time of writing, the Lambert report was not completed and no direct quotation is therefore possible. The major conclusions of the Rosenau became available in July, 1971, and will be referred to later in this section. The views presented here, however, remain the author's responsibility and do not necessarily coincide with those of any particular individual.

18. Table A, page 18. Source: *ICED Data Bank on International Programs of Higher Educational Institutions* (June, 1971).

19. Table B, page 18. Source: *Ibid.* (June, 1971).

20. James N. Rosenau, *International Studies and the Social Sciences: A Survey of the Status of International/Comparative Studies and Recommendations Concerning National Needs and Priorities,* Minnesota, International Studies Association (June, 1971), pp. 80–81.

21. Reference is made here to CEISAL (Consejo Europeo De Investigaciones Sociales Sobre America Latina) with headquarters at Bielefeld University, Germany.

22. These figures are based on the annual reports, *AID-Financed University Contracts,* Contract Services Division of the Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

23. See in particular the report by Richard H. Wood, *U.S. Universities: Their Role in AID-Financed Technical Assistance Overseas* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968.

24. J. A. Rigney, "Optimum Role for U.S. Overseas Advisors," *Strategies in Technical Assistance,* North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Tech. Bul. No. 189 (December, 1968), p. 21.

25. J. A. Rigney and J. K. McDermott, "Role of Technical Personnel in the Technical Assistance-Institution Building Process," *Strategies in Technical Assistance, op. cit.,* p. 1.

26. Edward W. Weidner, "Evaluation of the Impact of University Contracting Abroad," in Richard A. Humphrey (ed.), *Universities and Development Assistance Abroad* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1967), p. 152.

27. John Hilliard, "A Perspective on International Development," in Richard A. Humphrey (ed.), *op. cit.,* p. 180.

28. John W. Gardner, *op. cit.,* pp. 6-7.

29. John W. Gardner, *op. cit.,* p. 7.

30. International Association of Universities, *Summary Report, Fifth General Conference, Montreal, 31 August–5 September, 1970,* Supplement Volume XVIII, No. 4 (November, 1970).

31. Lester B. Pearson, *Partners in Development: Report of the Commission on International Development* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969).

32. Rudolph A. Peterson, *U. S. Foreign Assistance in the 1970's: A New Approach* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 4, 1970).

33. John W. Gardner, *op. cit.,* p. 18.

34. John Hilliard, "Perspective on Development," in Richard A. Humphrey (ed.), *op. cit.,* p. 195.

35. Adam Curle, *Problems of Professional Identity: An Examination of Training for Human Resource Development and Educational Planning* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968, Occasional Report No. 6), p. 56.

36. For a review of these reports see Willard L. Thorp, "Foreign Aid: A Report on the Reports," in *Foreign Affairs,* Vol. 48, No. 3 (April, 1970), pp. 561-573.

37. Pearson, *op. cit.*

38. See, for example, the *Report of the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs* (James A. Perkins, Chairman), October 25, 1968.

39. Rudolph A. Peterson, *op. cit.*

40. Peterson, *ibid.,* p. 4.

41. If the proposed legislation were passed, four development instruments would eventually exist: The U.S. International Development Corporation (IDC), the U.S. International Development Institute (IDI), the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), and the Inter-American Social Development Institute (ISDI). The last two are already in existence; the first two would replace AID. ISDI is slated to be renamed the Inter-American Foundation. Coordination of these four major developmental instrumentalities would be under the policy direction of the Secretary of State, but it was also made clear that the White House intended to exercise direct leadership in this area.

42. *Foreign Aid,* Message from the President of the United States, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives. Document No. 92-94, p. 2.

43. *Ibid.,* pp. 10-11.

44. Samuel P. Huntington, "Does Foreign Aid Have a Future?" in *Foreign Policy,* No. 2 (Spring, 1971), p. 133.

45. *The Institutional Development Agreement: A New Operational Framework for AID and the Universities,* report of a Joint Committee of the National Association

of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and the Agency for International Development (January, 1970).

46. *Ibid.*, pp. iv–v.

47. For a vivid treatment of the implications of this unfortunate project sponsored by the Special Operations Research Office of American University, launching a large-scale sociopolitical study of internal warfare in Latin America with funds provided by the Department of the Army, see Kalman H. Silvert, "Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad: The Lesson of Project Camelot," in *Background,* Vol. 9, No. 3 (November, 1965), pp. 215–236.

48. See, for example, Robert E. Ward, *Studying Politics Abroad, Field Research in the Developing Areas* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964).

49. Klaus Knorr, "Social Science Research Abroad: Problems and Remedies," in *World Politics,* Vol. XIX, No. 3 (April, 1967), pp. 465–485.

50. For a powerful statement on this entire issue, see Kalman A. Silvert, "Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad: The Lesson of Project Camelot," *op. cit.,* pp. 215–236.

51. Richard N. Adams (ed.), *Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1969), pp. 8–9.

52. For a most realistic and amusing paper on the role and function of th adviser on educational planning, see Adam Curle, *Educational Planning: The Adviser's Role* (UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1966).

53. This reference is to the educational exchange at the faculty level under the auspices of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961.

54. This topping-up does not necessarily make his salary in Africa equal to his U.S. salary, but it helps to meet such expenses as mortgage, insurance, and private schooling for his children.

55. Vernon I. Cheadle, *The University's Responsibility in International Educational Exchange,* a report of the meeting of the Continuation Committee for Educational Exchange, Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, December 2–5, 1966 (New York: Preparatory Committee of the International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange, 1967), p. 6.

56. Parts of the treatment of the topic under discussion represent an adaptation of the views presented in a paper written by the author, "Priorities for Research and Action in the Graduate Foreign Student Field," *Exchange* (Fall, 1970).

57. See especially College Entrance Examination Board, *University, Government and the Foreign Graduate Student,* summary of colloquium held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March, 1967 (Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969), and also College Entrance Examination Board, *The Foreign Graduate Student,* summary of colloquium held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, June, 1970 (Princeton: CEEB, 1971).

58. Kenneth A. Rogers, *Improving the Latin American Engineering Student's Experience in the U.S. University* (Washington: National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, 1971), pp. 2–3.

59. For a most helpful review of AID participants' program and academic performance, see American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, *AACRAO–AID Participant Selection and Placement Study* (Washington: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, March, 1971).

60. See *Modernization and the Migration of Talent,* Committee on International Migration of Talent (Education and World Affairs, 1970), pp. 60–71, and Gregory Henderson, *Emigration of Highly Skilled Manpower from the Developing Countries* (New York: United Nations Institute for Training and Research, 1970).

61. Department of State, Agency for International Development, VISTA, Department of Defense, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Peace Corps, Department of Agriculture, Smithsonian Institution, and National Science Foundation.

62. John W. Gardner, *op. cit.,* p. 45.

63. Alan Pifer, *Annual Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1966,* p. 14.

MAURICE HARARI is a graduate of Columbia College, and received his Ph.D. degree from the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University. He taught at Columbia and Dartmouth between 1952 and 1961, and from 1955 to 1957 was engaged in research in Europe and the Middle East on a Ford Foundation Foreign Area Fellowship. In 1961 he joined the International Training and Research Division of the Ford Foundation, and left two years later to become Vice President of Education and World Affairs, where he was primarily concerned with strengthening the international-intercultural dimension of higher education through studies, consulting, and a variety of other program activities. In 1968 he became Executive Director of Overseas Educational Service, an affiliate of Education and World Affairs. The latter agency was renamed the International Council for Educational Development, in 1970, and Dr. Harari was appointed its Director of University Studies. He is the author of *Government and Politics in the Middle East* (Prentice-Hall, 1962), and numerous articles and reviews, and is a contributor to several studies dealing with policy issues in higher education. His primary interest is academic planning and the organization and management of higher education at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

RICHARD C. SNYDER, Chairman of the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association, is Director of the Mershon Center at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

WILLIAM D. COPLIN, Chairman of the Education Commission of the International Studies Association, is Director of the International Relations Program of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

ROBERT W. GILMORE was a postdoctoral fellow at the National Institute of Mental Health, has taught at Kenyon College, Yale University, and the University of Pittsburgh, and has spent the last twenty years in community peace education and action. He is the President of the Center for War/Peace Studies and of the New York Friends Group.

GLOBAL DIMENSIONS IN U.S. EDUCATION:

THE UNIVERSITY, by Maurice Harari. An examination of the major policy issues confronting higher education in strengthening its international studies in the U.S. and in relating meaningfully to overseas societies. Covers the major issues of content and organization, as well as funding of international education programs.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOL, by James M. Becker and Maurice E. East. A discussion of the new social studies, and how recent developments apply to the international dimension of the curriculum. An analysis of trends, needs, and resources, with recommendations for improving international content and teaching at the secondary level.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, by Judith V. Torney and Donald N. Morris. A review of recent findings on attitude formation in elementary school children, touching on the processes and factors which affect attitude formation at various age levels. A description of a number of elementary school programs, in various parts of the U.S., where attempts have been made to improve the international dimension of the curriculum.

THE COMMUNITY, by William C. Rogers. A history and critical review of the efforts to involve adults in continuing education about world affairs and international relations. Insights into community and grass-roots work in this area, critical evaluations, and recommendations for future activity.

These four studies are published jointly by the Education Commission of the International Studies Association, the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association, and the Center for War/Peace Studies of the New York Friends Group, Inc.

Each individual study	$1.50
The set of four	$5.00

(Bulk rates on request)

Please send your order (including payment) or inquiry to any one of the following:

American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Center for War/Peace Studies
218 East 18th Street
New York, N.Y. 10003

International Relations Program
Chairman, ISA Education Commission
752 Comstock Avenue
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210